

Vindiciæ Veritatis:

OR, AN
Occasional Defence

OF THE
Principles and **Practices**
OF THE
People called *QUAKERS*.

IN
ANSWER to a TREATISE
OF
JOHN STILLINGFLEET's,
MIS-CALLED,
Seasonable Advice concerning Quakerism, &c.

By **Daniel Phillips, M. D.** *K.*

*Blessed are ye, when Men shall Revile you, and Persecute you,
and say all manner of Evil against you falsely for my
sake, Mat. 5. 11.*

Audi & alteram partem.

*Non multum Disputandum, nuda enim Veritas seipsam vali-
dissime tutatur, & probè intellecta, genuina sua luce tene-
bras omnes dispellit. Rob. Leighton Archep. Glasc.
Praelect Theol. & Parænes. p. 199.*

London, Printed and Sold by **T. Sowle,** in
White-Hart-Court in Gracious-street, 1703.

Veritas Vincit

Occasional Defence

of the

Principles of

Christianity

JOHN G. DODD



London: Printed by J. G. DODD, 1840.

Price 1s. 6d.

By the Author, 1840.

By the Author, 1840.

By the Author, 1840.

By the Author, 1840.

THE
PREFACE.

I Had hoped, Reader, that *Time, Vertue* and *Charity* would have created such an Understanding of us, in and with our Adversaries, as might have long since put an End to a *Peevish and Persecuting Temper* against us.

But alas! So it is, that since the *Law* hath restrained their Fury from *Fines and Goals*, some busie and forward *Priests* have (to recommend themselves perhaps for greater Preferments) conspired to load us with many *Calumnies*, and by that means endeavoured to stir up and engage our Neighbours and Magistrates against us: But God, that hath hitherto helped us, and maugre all their fierce *Anger and Enmity*, will still continue, we humbly hope and pray, to defend us against all their Attempts; and in the End (as he hath already begun to do, since this last Effort) not only *Clear* our Innocency, especially to the *Moderate Enquirer*, but

The PREFACE.

Augment our Reputation amongst the People; the *lessening* of which was, no doubt, a main part of their Design.

Among these, (tho' somewhat out of Time) as an *Epitomy* of the rest, or a *Postscript* at best, one John Stillingfleet, a *Lincolnshire Minister*, (and I am sorry I cannot say one of the most Ingenuous of them) has set himself to work against us: But much of his Undertaking is meer *Repetition*; as indeed are most of the *modern* Insults made upon us, which have been by us divers times already Answered, and that long ago: An Unfairness to be both *reprov'd* and *slighted* in an Adversary.

But he will perhaps say, *That he hath brought some fresh Materials, and does not Borrow all.* 'Tis true: But 'tis as true too, that they are *Frivolous*; and as *disingenuously* handled, as the rest of his *Predecessors* have done: Having *Violated* all the Laws of Controversie, as if we were of those Creatures of Prey, to whom none were to be observed. Which is abundantly manifested by the Ingenious Author of the following Treatise, and who hath shewn much Temper and Exactness in the performing of it.

Some of the *Unfair* and *Unreasonable* Methods generally taken by our Enemies,

of

The PREFACE.

of which we have so justly and often Complain'd, and wherein J. S. has not been a little Tardy, is as followeth :

1. *I must not give my own Sense of my own Words* ; which is certainly one of the hardest Cases in the World ; never deny'd to any Man by those that desire and deserve to be thought *Reasonable* : But it seems *Their* Exposition must be made *Mine*, to support their Charges, and palliate their Envy against me. Whereas nothing can, in common Sense, or with Truth, be called any Man's Faith, that he solemnly denies to be his Faith ; but rather one of *their making* that impose it upon him. This is our sad Case, with respect to the Dealings of our Adversaries.

2. But Secondly, A Man's own Writings *shall not be suffer'd* to speak for themselves. The Briefer or Obscurer Passages must not be allow'd to be interpreted, *by those more Plain and Conspicuous*, but by the Exposition of a declared Enemy.

Now tho' every Man is a Judge of another Man's Words, when they are *full* and *plain* ; yet no Man in Justice ought to be *definitive* on a Charge, before the Person, whose Words they are, is heard.

The P R E F A C E.

to his own Sense or Meaning by them, when their Obscurity is objected against. In this Case also we are Vilely Treated. Nor have I escaped this Usage from this Adversary, to whom the following Discourse is an Answer, and that in a tender Point, and Case of Importance, as I shall observe by the by.

3. Where things of Lesser Moment are spoken of by us in a way of *Comparison* only with Greater, as between *Christ* and the *Scriptures*, or *Water-Baptism* and the *Spirit's Baptism*, &c. they make us to *slight* the Lesser *in themselves*; not taking a Just Notice of the Occasion of so Writing, to wit, the *Inequality* of their Weight by the Comparison. Whereas, when we have occasion to Treat of those things upon their own Bottom, we yield them the Honour and Respect due to them.

4. Where things are only Transiently mention'd, being not the Subject-Matter, that in other places are distinctly and amply Treated upon, perhaps not Three Pages off, they shall *Wave* the Clearer and Fuller Passages, and *Dwell* on the more Imperfect or Obscure Expressions; to *Abuse* the Author, and *Credit* their Insinuations against him, and the People he adheres to.

5. Drop.

The P R E F A C E.

5. *Dropping of Explanatory Words* in the beginning, middle, or end of the very same Sentence or Paragraph, lest we should appear *nearer a-kin* to Soundness, or Orthodox Doctrine, (tho' the Sense be otherwise tolerably, if not conspicuously exprest) than stands with their design of Misrendring of us to their Readers.

6. The next is *Adding* of Words, to wring or bend a Passage (perhaps somewhat shortly exprest) to the Sense they would have it bear; lest their Imputations should *fail of Credit* with the People. Which Supplemental way, being the meer Invention and Strains of Prejudice, has deservedly merited the Odious Term of *Forgery*: And 'tis with some, or all of these *unfair Practices*, the Generality of our Antagonists have treated us, and our Christian Profession; and thereby endeavoured to raise a dislike to us, and an aversion in the People to the *Truth* of God, which, he in his great Mercy, has given us the Knowledge and Experience of. But he has in great measure disappointed their Purposes.

I have, above most Men, felt the Effects of this unfair Dealing; and truly many of us have cause to say, with that Eminent Servant of the Lord, (*Psal. 56. 5.*)

The PREFACE.

Every Day they wrest our Words, all their Thoughts are against us for Evil. But blessed be his great Name, we can also say, *The Lord is our Light and our Salvation, whom shall we fear? He is the Strength of our Life, of whom shall we be afraid?* Psal. 27. The Lord fighteth for his poor People, *by his Spirit*, in the Hearts of their Enemies; so that many of them have stopp'd in their Carreer, and been constrained to acknowledge, *That God is amongst us of a Truth.* Nor have I, with others, escaped the Lash of *J. Stillingfleet's* Pen in particular in this Treatise, to which the following is an *Answer*, and thither I must refer the Reader for my Vindication. I will not therefore anticipate the Reader, since the Defence made for me, as well as my many Friends, equally ill treated by him, is so well performed by the Author: Only thus much, That I can hardly comprehend how any Man, that desires to be *Just*, and that had not *much* rather, we were in the *Wrong* than in the *Right*, (which must shew the worst of Minds) could affirm, That I deny'd Jesus Christ (who, I believe, laid down his Life without the Gates of *Jerusalem* for the Sins of the World) to be the *Son of God*; because I said, That
the

The P R E F A C E.

the Body, or Outward Person that Dy'd, could not **properly** be said to be the Son of God, but rather the Body or Outward Person of the Son of God; taking and making the terms *Body*, and *Outward Person*, to be *Synonymous*, or the same thing. Which Distinction I was only led to make, because *T. Jenner*, against whom I writ, had laid down his Proposition too near the Doctrine of *L. Muggleton*, who asserts God himself to have dyed, as well as his Body; which the Scripture tells us, God had prepared of the *Seed of Abraham* for his Beloved Son to do his Will in; as the Scope of the place and Context, and particularly the *Confession* made by me to Jesus Christ as the Son of God, page 149. of the *Apology*, doth Express, as well as Import. And at this rate, what may not Men say of any Person, or Religious Perswasion, or Principles whatsoever? It was by the *same Methods* that the ancient Enemies of Christianity used to *pervert* the Right Way of the Lord, as *Celsus*, *Porphry*, *Julian*, &c. And the same means were imploy'd by the Opposers of the Reformation, to defame it, and the Instruments thereof; as *Reinexius* and *Rubis Capitaneis*, against the *Waldenses*; the *Council of Constance*, against *John Hus* and *Jerom of Prague*; *Henry the 8th*,
Eckius

The P R E F A C E.

Eckius and *Priarius*, against *M. Luther*; and *Cardinal Perron*, &c. against *Calvin* and *Beza*; and *Harding*, *Stapleton*, *Fisher*, &c. against our English and First Protestants and Martyrs.

Let the Writings of any of the Members of any of the Churches of *England*, *Germany* and *France*, at the time of Reformation, be consulted; and it will appear, that they made the same Complaint we do, of the Injustice, Partiality and Abuse of their Adversaries, in reference to their *Misgiving* of their Principles, *Abusing* of their Writings, and rendring them, not only Erroneous, but *Inconsistent with Government* too, that they might fire the Civil Magistrate upon them, as the *Jews* would have done the *Romans* upon the *Primitive Christians*, as *Enemies to Caesar*. Yet God, that never left his own Cause of *Light* and *Truth*, in any Age, (nor the Professors thereof, till they left him) in the End crown'd it, through Faithful Witnesses, above the Power of *Ignorance*, *Envy* and *Cruelty*; of which our Nation has been an Incontestable Proof. May a right Use be made of those Unvaluable Mercies by all Ranks and Qualities therein, lest the same Merciful and Good God, by the deep and manifold

The P R E F A C E.

manifest Provocations of the Inhabitants thereof, leave us to Inherit the miserable Fruits of their own Evil Doings.

I confess I have but a Sorrowful Prospect of the Issue of Things, while I see some *Priests* and *Levites*, not only *Galloping* by the *Wounded* and *Plunder'd* Man, without Sense or Bowels, but Arming themselves to *Tilt* at their quiet Neighbours in the Land; and further Wounding, instead of applying the Balm of Christian Charity to heal them.

I heartily wish they were more concern'd for a *Common* and *National Vertue*, and that they would approve themselves *Champions* against Sin, rather than against their Neighbours; and put some *Stop* and *Boundary*, by their Authority, to the *Floods of Wickedness* and *Profanation*, which every where flow through *Markets, Fairs, Publick Houses* and *Places of Resort*, and too much in the *Streets* and *High ways* also, to the great *Scandal* of Religion at large, and *Grief* of them that have the least Fear towards Almighty God, and the Belief of the World to come: And indeed it is their Duty, and therefore ought to be their Care, because they are very sensible to whose Communion or Church those People belong.

The PREFACE.

O that Vertue was but once the Study and Standard of Humane Society, and of Quiet and Comfortable Living! We should see better Days, and be a good deal on our way to *Compound* the Differences that remain about *Revealed Religion*, which *Pride*, *Covetousness*, *Rancour*, *Superstition* and *Persecution*, can never effect: And I must needs say, That some of the *Wiseſt* and *Beſt* Men, of every Party or Profession, are generally of this Mind. And 'tis Pity there should be any Temptation in *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtick Policy*, to obſtruct ſo Good, as well as ſo Great a Work, as is that of a **Vertuous Uniformity**; without which, all Attempts to *force* a Church-One, will be *Vain*, if not Irreligious and Dangerous.

Reader, This is a fruitful Subject, and very ſuitable to my Inclination, as well as the Times and State of Things; but I muſt remember, I am writing a *Preface*, and not a Book, and that I ought not to detain thee from one ſo well and amply done in a *Polemick* way. I will therefore conclude, with this Requeſt, That Chriſt and his Servants Sayings may live with weight upon thy Spirit in the peruſal of the following Treatiſe, and others of like Tendency, leſt the warmth of Controverſie ſhould transport thee beyond bounds, *viz.*
Learn

The P R E F A C E.

Learn what this means, I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice. He that will be my Disciple, let him take up his Cross daily, and follow me. What ye would that others should do unto you, do ye likewise so unto them. They that do the Will of God, shall know of my Doctrine, whether it be of God, or no. Not he that saith, Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the Will of my Father which is in Heaven, shall enter the Kingdom. He is not a Jew, that is one outward; neither is that Circumcision, which is outward in the Flesh: But he is a Jew, that is one inward; and Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter, whose Praise is not of Men, but of God. Circumcision availeth nothing, nor Uncircumcision, but a New Creature. Follow Peace with all Men, and Holiness, without which no Man shall see the Lord. Have your Fruits unto Holiness, and your End shall be Everlasting Life. Try all things, and hold fast that which is good. Lo I come, and my Reward is with me; who will Recompence every Man according to his Work, whether it be Good, or whether it be Evil.

For which Great and Final Day of Reckoning, let us all prepare, that our Accounts we may give with Joy at last.

W. Penn.
THE

T H E
INTRODUCTION.

B*Y* Designing Men, the Principles and Practices of the People called Quakers have been repeatedly drawn in such unbecoming Colours, that those who know the Originals in their native Dresses, could scarce, be perswaded they ever saw them before, when so disfigured. Were they really such, as by malicious Hands they are painted, they are enough to affright and terrifie those who transiently cast their Eyes on 'em, and sufficient to excite a general Detestation in the Minds of Pious Men against 'em; especially if such should be so easie, as to satisfie themselves with Reading only the Objections of our Adversaries, without Considering our Replies. But 'tis presumed, that the Unbyassed, who have heard the Accusations of the Plaintiff, will not determine their Judgments till the Defendant's Answer is duly considered: For the perusal of such, the following Sheets are chiefly designed.

I am satisfied, the various Senses that may be given to one and the same Term, make most Propositions liable to be interpreted several ways: This is undeniable from the different Commentaries published on the New Testament. The Atheists, Jews, &c. give most Passages, capable of being wrested to our disadvantage, the worst Construction they will bear, designedly, to Ridicule, to Expose, and to prove it Fabulous and Inconsistent; consequently unworthy to be accounted the Dictates of the Almighty. In Answer to these Set of Men, the Christians have
Inter-

The INTRODUCTION.

Interpreted the same Passages in a good Sense, Proved the Matters of Fact, as much as the Nature of the things would bear, Reconciled the seeming Inconsistence, and Demonstrated, that there is nothing in the Sacred Writings unbecoming the Revelations of the Great JEHOVAH.

As the Atheist, Jews, &c. have done by the Scriptures, so the Enemies of our holy Profession have done by us: They have Curtailed some Sentences, Misinterpreted others; sometimes added Terms of their own, and then quoted their own Alterations as our Words, intentionally to render Us odious, and our Principles abominable. Of these Unfair Practices, the Rector is guilty, as the ensuing Discourse will abundantly prove.

We deny not, that several of our Ancient Friends Expressions are, without considering the Context, harsh, and may be construed in a Sense which we dislike as much as our Opposers can. I provoke the whole Herd of our Adversaries, to cite (if they can) one Essential of Christianity, which we have Heterodoxly defended: But seeing our Words may be interpreted also in a defensible Sense, may we not vindicate them in that, without being stigmatized with the worst of Characters? We justify them only as bearing an Orthodox Interpretation: Are we to be condemned for this? Certainly no. Doth not common Morality, without mentioning Christian Charity, oblige us to entertain Favourable Sentiments concerning our Neighbours, till we are certain they merit the contrary; and to give their Words the most Charitable Construction they will admit, till they have had an opportunity to explain their Intentions, in terms not so liable to a Misconstruction? Let 'em give us such Quarter as they would

The INTRODUCTION.

would expect from others, and we shall desire no other Favour at their hands.

Orig.
cont.
Cels.
p. 195.

A Parallel might, in several respects, be drawn between those who, in the first Centuries, opposed the Doctrines of Jesus Christ, and our Adversaries in this age; As Celsus did by the Scriptures of Truth, of whom Origen bears this Testimony, Celsus nostri odio magis, quam Veritatis studio permotus, historias colligit: atque eas tantum attingat, quæ ad accusationem videntur facere. Celsus's hatred of us, more than his love to Truth, hath induced him to collect some instances, which may be interpreted to our Prejudice, passing by all those that would have turned to our Advantage. So have our Enemies done by us: They have misconstrued our Words, and forced them to a Sense we never intended; if any one of us hath explained his Sentiments, concerning an Article of the Christian Faith, a Thousand times Orthodoxly, that is by our Opposers pass'd over in silence; but if he hath dropped any Sentence, that may be wrested to an ill Sense, that is represented as the Standard of his Belief, and Heterodoxly aggravated, to the utmost of their abilities. As the first Promulgators of the Christian Religion were generally Tradesmen, ignorant of the Learning then in vogue; so the first Publishers of our Principles were mostly Illiterate Persons, unqualified in outward appearance for so great an Undertaking. As they had none of the Great Men of the Earth to advocate their Cause, no more had we. Wickliff had his John of Gaunt, Luther his Duke of Saxony, Calvin the States of Geneva, and Francis the Second King of France, to Patronize their Followers: For which Reasons, 'tis not surprizing, if their Adherents increased; but for us to stem the Tide, as I may say,

The INTRODUCTION.

say, against the whole World, is really wonderful. As their Writings were sifted by their Enemies, and read chiefly with an expectation of finding some Passage to carp at; so have ours been: O the Joy and Triumph of him, that first espies a Sentence, which will seemingly bear an ill Construction! As there are several Passages in their Writings not so well guarded as they might have been; the like may be found in our Treatises. As the Professors and Priests of that Age were their greatest Persecutors; so their Successors have been the principal Men that have Mocked, Reviled, and spoken all manner of Evil undeservedly against us. I might have carried this Analogy much farther; but these few Instances may suffice, to shew what Spirit reigned in former Times, and that the same presides in the Hearts of many in this our Day.

Possibly some of our National Ministry may think, that I have been in certain places a little too free with them: They may consider, that what I have done, is only in mine and my Friends defence: The Arrows which I have retorted on them, are such as one of their Society hath lately thrown on us. I should not have concerned my self at this time with their Principles or Practices, had not they been the Aggressors. If they cannot let us alone, but must be throwing their Darts at us, they have no reason to complain, if we return them again. As long as they continue these methods of assaulting us, they have no just cause of Offence, if we defend our selves as often as we think the Assailant is worthy of our notice.

It may be objected, That in some Pages I am guilty of Tautologies: But this Objection possibly will not be thrown upon me by the Rector; because, in following his Repetitions, I have been necessitated to do those things, which otherwise I might have avoided. Had

The INTRODUCTION.

I not taken this method, it may be J. S. would have imagined, that I had given the go-by to some Quotations, because they were not Defensible, to which now he'll find an Answer.

It hath been the method of some to drop a great many of their former Accusations, and to start new ones; whereby the Bulk of their Books are considerably augmented, and the Respondent by degrees, if he will trace them, drawn into a large Field of Controversie; out of which he shall not, without a great deal of Labour, find a Passage: Others have gone on in reiterating their former Charges, taking little or no notice of our Replies. If my Opponent shall think fit to take either of these methods in answering me, he must excuse me, if I do not follow him: But if he will do by me, as I have done by him, and act like a fair Disputant, he may the more reasonably expect a Reply.

It's possible, some may imagine, that I have been in some places too Critical with my Adversary concerning the Syntax, &c. of his Periods: Had not he reflected upon us, on account of ours, I should not have esteemed such Oversights worthy of notice. But seeing he is culpable in writing false English, and this very thing is one of his Objections against us, he must excuse me, as often as I retort the same Charges on himself; and demonstrate, that he is culpable in those very things that he objects as Crimes against us.

The Typographical Errata's, which have escaped the Press, the Reader is desired to correct with a favourable Pen, and not to impute them to the Author; such as, Snake in the Grace, for Snake in the Grass; *primativa*, for *primitiva*; Grace, for Græce; and all others, that may be transiently met with, whether they relate to Orthography or Syntax.

AP 59

D. P.

December 4. 1702,

The

The Titles of our Friends Books,
and the Pages, out of which F. S.
makes his Objections.

The Pages wherein
the Objections are
Answer'd in the fol-
lowing Treatise.

	Page.		Page.
A ddress to Protestants	119		73
The Barbadoes Paper----			48
E. Burrough's Epist. to his Works			52
			54
			55
His Works	416		134
	190, 191		177
	105		206
	273		105
Christian Quaker-----	139		60
Discovery of the great Enmity } of the Serpent-----	13		196
	17		130
Discovery of the Man of Sin-----	38		131
	11		163
S. Eccles's Letter to J. S. &c.---			173
Epistle of Caution -----	3		19
G. Fox's Order about Apparel, &c.			34
Answer to O. Cromwell			129
Paper-----			66
Great Mystery-----	250		185
Ishmael-----	17		132
News out of the North----	14		133
	39		189
	14		103
A Question to Professors -----	33		122
Reason against Railing -----	109		184
	150		89
Serious Apology -----	146		62
W. Smith's Primmer -----	8		65
Catechism-----	57		

Sword

<i>Sword of the Lord drawn</i> ———	5	—————	106
<i>Switch</i> ———	157	—————	13
—————	182	—————	42
—————	37,38	—————	57
—————	262	—————	108
—————	261	—————	113
—————	265	—————	125
—————	265	—————	139
—————	492	—————	194
—————	164	—————	203
<i>True Ministry, Title-page</i> ———		—————	137
<i>Truth and Innocency</i> ———	15	—————	83
<i>Yearly-Meetings Advice to J.S. &c.</i>		—————	164
<i>Yearly-Meeting Paper, 1675</i> ———		—————	201
<i>Concerning the Hat</i> ———		—————	29
————— <i>Thee and Thou</i> ———		—————	13
————— <i>Lord's Supper</i> ———		—————	117
————— <i>Baptism</i> ———		—————	107
————— <i>Womens Preachings</i> ———		—————	141
————— <i>Meetings</i> ———		—————	160
————— <i>Tithes</i> ———		—————	231

7 AP 59

Vindicia

Vindiciæ Veritatis :

O R,

An Occasional Defence of the
Principles and Practices of the
People called *Quakers*, &c.

THere hath not been any Learned *Rabbi*,
of this or former Ages, so exact in
his Expressions, relating to Religious
or Civil Affairs, as always to word his Matter
so nicely, that a perverse and prejudiced Mind
could not warp and force it, to a Sense con-
trary to his Intent and Design. If this, which
is easily proved, should be granted, I am satis-
fied, few Unprejudiced Persons would be sur-
prized to meet with certain Sentences, which
may have dropped from an unlearned *Quaker*,
capable of being wrested to a sense, which may
render it obnoxious : But as long as the Intent
and Drift of the Author was *Orthodox*, and that
it was so, is demonstrable from the Thread of
the Discourse, running through all his Writings;
'tis presumed, that no sincere Follower of a
Crucified Jesus will make a few mutilated and
mis-interpreted Passages, the Standard of any
Man's Opinion ; nor, without a mature and de-
liberate Examination of the Scope and Intent
of the Author, cry out, *Heresie, Blasphemy, &c.*

B

I am

I am not surprized to meet with some Periods in our ancient Books, that are not so exactly worded, as they might have been: But what I more admire at, is, that our Mercenary Adversaries, with their great Industry, have not misrepresented and mis-interpreted more Passages, than yet they have done; considering our *Friends* have written so many large Volumes, and were, generally speaking, Mechanicks, and ignorant of School-Distinctions.

Upon the whole matter, I do not perceive, that there is any occasion for us to retract any particular Passage, so long as we are satisfied our *Primitive Friends* Intentions and Meanings were found; tho' not so cautiously penn'd, as we could have wished they had been; and we can give these numerical Sentences Orthodox Interpretations. I provoke the whole Herd of our Adversaries to produce one Sentence, relating to the *Fundamentals of Christianity*, which we have erroneously defended. For my self, I can declare, that to the best of my remembrance, I have not met with one Period, in any of our ancient Writings, which I cannot stand by, and with as little difficulty vindicate, as some Passages in the *New Testament* may be defended, against the Clamours of the *Jews* and *Atheists*.

To wipe off the Dust, one of our *Opponents* hath lately thrown upon us, by his Falsity in Assertion, Partiality in Quotation, and Fallaciousness in his Conclusions, in his Treatise called, *Seasonable Advice concerning Quakerism, &c.* these following Sheets are designed: Tho' in my opinion, it might have been more properly termed *Unseasonable Advice*; because the Author's

thor's drift there seems to be, to divide the *Protestant Interest* in *England*, by endeavouring to raise *Persecution* amongst the *Queen's Peaceable Subjects*, &c. Which doubtless, at this Juncture, would be of a pernicious Consequence to our Nation, but extreamly advantagious to our Enemies: For which Reason, such Endeavours, as these are, would better become one of our Incendiaries, than a pretended Minister of the Church of *England*.

The Rector begins his Introduction; *Seeing* The Introduction considered. *in these Days of Liberty, the Calves of Jeroboam are set up amongst us, I thought I could not employ some part of my time better, than to endeavour, with God's assistance, to preserve you in the true Worship of the God of Israel.*

What this Man means, by *the Calves of Jeroboam*, which are set up in *these Days of Liberty*, I blush not to acknowledge, that I do not understand it: Whether it is from my Dulness in apprehending of things, or from the Obscurity of his Terms, is left to the Judicious Readers Determination. I am subject to believe, by *These Days of Liberty*, he includes all the time since our Legislators have been pleased to favour the *Protestant Dissenters* with an Act for *Liberty of Conscience*. But what the *Calves of Jeroboam* are, which have been set up since that time, I cannot divine. It cannot, properly speaking, be the Opinions of the *Dissenters* in general, or of the *Quakers* in particular, whose Mis-interpreted Sentences are the Subject of his Book; because these Opinions were published long before that Act for *Liberty of Conscience* was made, as may be easily

proved from the Year wherein the Books were printed, out of which J. S. hath very disingenuously taken his Quotations. If there is any thing among Professing Christians, which hath an Analogy with *Jeroboam* and his *Calves*, 'tis, in my opinion, the *Tithes* which the *Romish Priests* got settled on themselves and Successors, in the darkest Times of *Popery*, by Acts of Parliament, &c. Their *Legislators* may, in some respects, be compared to *Jeroboam*; and the *Tithes*, to his *Calves*; which the *Popish Priests*, in a sense, adore; and our decimating Ministers, following their steps, persecute to the utmost severity of the Law, such as cannot, with a Safe Conscience, pay them their pretended Dues. I am perswaded, could the *Quakers* (so called) pay the National Ministry their Tithes, they would not for the future hire such Apostates, as *F. Bugg*, *G. Keith*, &c. to represent them as *Blasphemers*, *Hereticks*, &c.

Tho' it is not evident, what he intends by the *Calves of Jeroboam*; yet this seems manifest, from his saying, *In these Days of Liberty, the Calves of Jeroboam are set up amongst us*, that he dislikes the Act for *Liberty of Conscience*. Is not this to compare those that made that Act, viz. our late King and both Houses of Parliament, to *Jeroboam*, an Idolatrous King in *Israel*? If these cannot escape his Censorious Pen, 'tis no wonder then, that the same Ink should bespatter us, which hath done the like to his and our Superiours.

Neither are these words, *In these Days of Liberty, the Calves of Jeroboam are set up amongst us*, restricted only to the *Quakers*, but include also

also the *Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists*, and all other *Protestant Societies*, dissenting from the National Church. What a reverse to the Parliaments Endeavours are this Country Parson's Scribbles! They are for *Uniting the Queen's Protestant Subjects in Interest and Affection*; but this Priest, no doubt, conceiting himself wiser than our Legislators, and on that account represents, by his Simile, those that are Recognized as *Protestant Dissenters*, by the late Act for Liberty, *Idolatrous Worshipers of the Golden Calves of Jeroboam*. It is evident, by this Act, that our Superiours are for healing our private Heats; but this Man, by his malicious Comparison, seems to be for fomenting them; our Superiours are for increasing Love and Friendship amongst us, but this Man seems to be for the contrary; our Superiours are for uniting the *Queen's Protestant Subjects in Interest and Affection*, but this Man seems to be for dis-uniting them. Such Modes of Speech, at this time of day, would, in my thoughts, be fitter for a Firebrand of Persecution, than a nominal Minister of Christ.

What relates to the latter part of this Period, *I thought I could not employ some part of my time better, than to endeavour, with God's assistance, to preserve you in the true Worship of the God of Israel*: We unanimously agree, that no time is better spent, than what is employed either in Convincing those that are in Errors, or in Preserving those that are already Convinced, *in the true Worship of the God of Israel*. But we cannot believe, that the Path *J. S.* treads in, will ever lead us to the Temple, where the *God of Israel* is truly worshipped; because in

many places it is clouded with gross Perversions, reiterated Calumnies, and notorious Falsties; as these following Pages will abundantly demonstrate.

Four Lines under the former Passage, he saith, *I am very sensible the Errors of Quakerism have of late been so notoriously exposed to the World, that there is little new to be said on a Subject, that seems to be already exhausted.*

If the *Errors of Quakerism* (as he terms it) have been of late so notoriously exposed, certainly the Rector has but little to do, when he can imploy so much time, in repeating those Matters which others have already done: Tho' the preceding words seem to imply, that he hath done nothing but, as an Eccho, recited the words of others; yet we must not imagine, that such an ingenious Man as he is, would only, *actum agere*, without some cogent Reasons, to satisfy his Reader, that he hath a sufficient motive to induce him to draw up this Inditement against the *Quakers*; he adds three lines under the former, *Tho' the Quaker-Controversie has at large been discussed in several late Treatises*, (in the Margin is cited, *The Snake in Grass; The Defence of the Snake; G. K's 4th Narr. &c.*) yet it cannot be supposed, that Persons of your Employments should either have the Leasure or Opportunity to read them.

This is such a notable Argument to induce a Man to publish his Thoughts to the World, on a Subject that hath been so amply discussed before, that I am perswaded his Judicious Friends and Brethren will blush at the Vanity of the Man therein. What argues a greater Conceit

Conceit of a Man's own Abilities, than a supposition that his Friends and Brethren would not find as much Leisure, and have as many Opportunities, to read the *Snake in the Grace*, its *Defence*, and *Keith's Fourth Narrative*, as his Elaborate Piece? Are not these Books written in the same Language? Don't they treat on the same Subjects? What Reason this Man hath to entertain such Towering Thoughts of his own Writings, I do not perceive: For if we consider his Language, it is not more even and pure than theirs, his Proofs are not more Convincing, his Inferences are not more Natural, his Scribbles are not more Concise and Instructive, than *Keith's*, &c. If in any thing he exceeds them, probably it may be in his Envy, Malice, and Conceitedness.

CHAP. I.

The Objections against our Practices considered and enervated.

AFTER the Examination of his Introduction, I shall now proceed to the Consideration of his Book. Near the foot of his Discourse, he desires that his Writings may be Answered *Section by Section*: To oblige him, in the following Pages he shall find his Petition answered. P. 115.

I think it necessary to caution you, not to be p. 1. caught, or imposed upon, by that demure Behaviour and seeming Strictness, by which the Friends love to be distinguished from the rest of their Neighbours.

We never desired our Neighbours to be imposed upon, by any demure Behaviour, or seeming Strictness, which may be observed in any of our Friends, or in the *Black Tribe*, till they have experienced, that their Lives and Conversations exactly agree with their Pretences. Could we have Peace within, 'twould not be our choice to distinguish our selves from the rest of our Neighbours, either in *Dress, Behaviour, or Language*. An exact Observation of these trivial things, as some account them, is no small Cross to our Natural Inclinations. Did we not really believe these Practices our Indispensible Duty, it cannot be reasonably supposed, that we would thereby expose our selves, as Butts for the Scum of the Earth to shoot their Scurilities at.

As the Rector hath cautioned his Reader *not to be imposed upon, by the demure Behaviour and seeming Strictness of the Quakers*: So I intreat those, that have the Curiosity to read our Adversaries Writings, not to determine from certain shreds of Sentences, unjustly patched together, or from some mis-interpreted Passages, that we are Erroneous; but that they would (before they come to a definitive Sentence in themselves) give the Books cited a serious View; without which, it is morally impossible for a Man to have a true Idea of the Sentiments of another. When this is Considerately done, without doubt they will give in a Verdict in our favour.

We are not unsensible how great a part of Mankind, see with the Eyes of their Teachers,
and

and judge with their Understandings, without Examining, as the *Noble Bereans* did, whether things really were as common Fame represented them. Thus the Commonalty in the Days of our Saviour, blindly following the *Priests, Scribes* and *Pharisees*, ignorantly assented to the Crucifying of the *Lord of Life*: And afterwards, by the same motives, persecuted his Disciples; amongst these often are Persons that have good Inclinations, great Parts, and a Zeal for God. Thus *Paul*, a Learned Man, brought up at the Feet of *Gamaliel*, and extremely Zealous for the Traditions of his *Fathers*, through the Instigation of the *Priests*, &c. became a violent Persecutor of the Servants of the despised *Jesus*. As in former Days, so in these, had Men a thorow Knowledge of the principal Engines of Persecution; the *Chief Priests* and their *Hirelings*, would be found to be the most considerable movements therein. And considering the same Temper and Spirit now reigns, which did in the *Apostles* time, it is not improbable but that our Adversaries may be now a doing what the *Enemies of Christianity* then did. Therefore I caution the Inhabitants of this Nation, not to Condemn us from the false Glosses and malicious Turns, prejudiced Persons may give our Words, till they have considered our Answers.

He goes on, *A shew of Humility, Meekness and Self-denial, has been always apt to cheat the World.*

For which Reason, it may be, *J. S.* hath shewn so little of these three Christian Vertues in his Writings against us.

Two

Two lines under the former Quotation, he saith, *The Pharisees are well known to have had a wonderful Interest with the People, by making a greater shew of Piety and Holiness, than was to be observed in the Lives of others.*

We can readily subscribe to the Truth of this Assertion, not only from what is recorded of them in the Holy Scriptures; but we are also confirmed in the probability thereof, from the Actions of their *Successors*, in this our Age. Doth not the *Rector*, and many of his *Brethren*, agree with the *Pharisees* of former times, in those very Instances, wherein he draws a parallel between them and the *Quakers*, and in many others? Do not they endeavour to get Interest among the People, by their pretended Sanctity, and Shews of Holiness; and on this Score, distinguish themselves by a particular Garb? Do they not therefore assume to themselves the title of *Clergy*, i. e. *Inheritance*; inferring from thence, that they are God's *peculiar Inheritance*? Do they not love the uppermost Rooms at Feasts, and the chief Seats in the Synagogue, and Greetings in the Market-places, and to be called of Men *Rabbi, Rabbi*? Are they not as careful of the Fleece as of the Flock? Do not they expose the Fatherless, and devour the Houses of Widows, by sending them to Prison for their pretended Dues, and by taking the most pernicious and destructive ways the Law will admit, when by easier methods they may obtain the Tenths of their Neighbours Labours? Do not such Actions as these, notwithstanding their seeming Sanctity, evidently demonstrate, that tho' they have

Mat. 23.
6, 7.

have a Form of Godliness, yet they want the Power of it.

After he hath Scoffed at our Sober Deportment, Self-denial, and Contempt of the vain Customs and ridiculous Habits of this World, in the third Page, he saith, *Do but fancy then the Friends stript of these goodly Ornaments, and they would not be taken notice of in the World.*

What! would not a People, that are stigmatized with the odious Titles of *Seducers*, *Blasphemers* and *Hereticks*, be taken notice of in the *Christian World*, if they were divested of their *Solemn Looks*, *Set Phrases*, *Different Habits*, and *Odd way of Address*? If these Externals are the principal things that distinguish us from our Neighbours, then, in my opinion, it will evidently follow from these words of J. S. that he believes we are neither *Seducers*, *Blasphemers*, or *Hereticks*; because, were we either of these, it is not to be doubted but a *Christian Nation* would take more notice of such, than of one that only differs from his Neighbours in his *Solemn Looks*, *Set Phrases*, *Different Habits*, and *Odd way of Address*.

We are so far from being ashamed of our *Modest Apparel*, *Plain Language*, and *Sober Behaviour in Conversation*, that we take Satisfaction therein; especially since we have been Convinced that it is our Duty, and that by our Singularity in these things, we tread in the same Paths the *Primitive Christians* did walk in, as is evident from the Monuments of Antiquity, as a Witness in this matter. Consider what *Quzelius*, in his *Animadversions on Minutius*

natus Fœlix, saith; his words are: "The Primitive Christians were reproached by the Gentiles, for their Ill-breeding, rude and unpolish'd Language, unfashionable Behaviour, as a People that knew not how to carry themselves in their Addresses and Salutations, calling them Rusticks and Clowns; which the Christians easily bore, valuing their Profession the more for its Non-conformity to the World. Therefore it was usual with them, by way of Irony and Contempt, to call the Gentiles the Well-bred, and Eloquent, and the Learned. This he abundantly proves from ample Citations out of *Arnobius, Lactantius, Isidorus, Theodorus*, and others.

P. 4. After a general Censure of some of the *Quakers Practices* in his first Section, he begins his second with a particular Instance thereof, *viz.* In the first place (says he) I will begin with their famous Controversie of Theeing and Thouing; this is what the Quakers call the pure and plain Language.

What Error is there in calling a Language pure, which is spoken according to the exact Rules of Grammar? Or plain, which hath none of the Ornament of Polite Learning in it? If to say *Thee* and *Thou*, had been an Error, certainly God would never have used that Form of Speech to *Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses*, or to his *Prophets*, nor they to him. Neither can it be imagined, that *Jesus Christ*, his Apostles or Ministers, in the purest times of Christianity, would have left in their Writings such Modes of Speech, if they were Erroneous.

*No Man, that is not given up to the Delusions P. 5.
of Quakerism, can imagine Theeing and Thou-
ing, to be Bearing the Cross.*

By these and the foregoing words, he seems to insinuate, that we make the *Cross of Christ* to consist only in *Theeing* and *Thouing*; and would confirm his Reader in that Opinion, from a lame Quotation out of the *Switch*, viz. *If any, to shun the Cross of our Lord Jesus,—shall say You, instead of Thee and Thou; such will find that Disobedience their Burthen.* No doubt, it is an Eternal Truth, that if any, to please the proud and ambitious Spirit in Man, shall say *You*, instead of *Thee* and *Thou*, (who are Convinced, by the Spirit of Truth in themselves, the contrary is their Duty) intentionally to shun the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, but such will find their *Disobedience their Burden.* Tho' we do not restrict the Bearing of the Cross only to such Forms of Speech; yet when they are obliged to use these terms to their Superiours, in a denial to Self, and in a great abnegation to their Natural Inclinations, only to have Peace in their own Consciences; at such times, we verily believe, that the *plain Language* may be justly accounted to relate to the Doctrine of the Cross.

Having thus briefly considered *J. Wyeth's* words, as dis-ingenuously printed by this Rector, I shall now quote them as they are placed in the *Switch*, viz. "If any, to shun the Cross of our Lord Jesus, tho' in this small matter of the *plain Language*, and to please the vain Mind, contrary to the Convictions of the Spirit of Truth in themselves, shall say *You*,
"instead

“ instead of *Thee* and *Thou*; such will find that
 “ Disobedience their Burden. Hereby it is
 evident, that *J. W.* doth not limit the Cross
 of our Lord Jesus, to saying *Thee* and *Thou*
 but only tells those, that do believe the plain
Language their Duty, yet meerly to gratifie
 proud and ambitious Mind, and contrary to
 the Convictions of the *Spirit of Truth* in them-
 selves, shall say *You*, instead of *Thee* and *Thou*
 that such will find that Disobedience their
 Burden.

He recites two Passages on this Subject, out
 of the Writings of that *Ingenious Person*, (as he
 calls him) *the Snake*, which probably he accounts
 unanswerable by us; the first of them is, *Whether*
 P. 5. *there there is any Immorality or Iniquity in these*
Letters T.O.U, more than in T.H.O.U.

My Answer is, There is no Immorality or
 Iniquity in any of the Letters that compose
 the word *You* or *Thou*, or in any other Let-
 ter of the Alphabet, materially considered. Is
 there any of our Friends that have said the con-
 trary? If none have drop'd such a Sentence,
 I do not conceive, there is any occasion for
 me to consider it; because the Controversie
 which we have had with our Adversaries, hath
 not been, Whether there is any *Immorality* or
Iniquity in the Elements of Words, or in the
 Articulate Sound *You*, more than in the Arti-
 culate Sound *Thou*, or in the Idea which the
 term *You* or *Thou* excites in the Mind of the
 Hearer, when it is pronounced.

P. 5. The second is, *Whether every Nation is not*
Master of its own Language.

No doubt, this is very true, and that 'tis Custom chiefly which determines the Signification of Words. Hence it is, that *Thee* may as well be used before a Verb, as *Thou*; because the generality of our Nation do use it so.

If any oppose the using of *Thee* in the Nominative Case, let them produce their Arguments, why we may not as well use *Thee*, as *Me*, before a Verb. Nothing is more common with the greatest Masters of the *English Tongue*, than to say, *Me thinks*. Seeing it is accounted good Syntax to say *Me thinks*, why may not People as properly say *Thee thinks*, as *Me thinks*? Let those that Censure us, for using *Thee*, Nominatively give their Reasons. If any urge *Custom*, that will militate against them. Let them but critically observe the words of their Familiars, and they will find *Thee*, much oftner than *Me*, placed before a Verb.

We affirm, By the Custom of the Country, (You) P. 66
may very properly be used either in the Singular or Plural Number.

John, Thy bare Affirmation, without sufficient Proofs in this case, will not do; because, after a due Consideration of this Matter, I cannot find *You* ever used in the Singular Number: If the Rector will give me one Instance thereof, he will oblige me. If we consider all the Verbs that are annexed to *You*, we shall find them of the Plural Number. If any will say that *You*, when it is spoken to one, is of the Singular Number, tho' the Verb may be Plural; this will be to make all Men guilty of false Syntax. But if *You* is always joyned to Verbs which are Plural, as is easily proved, then *John's* Affirmation

tion to the contrary, is not to be much regarded. Let me, for once, joyn Verbs of the Singular Number to *You*, and by considering the harshness of such Phrases, as, *How dost you do? Wilt you go? You speakest good English;* the Illiterate may determine the Truth of J. S.'s Assertion.

P. 7. *If Impropropriety of Speech must be accounted a Sin, I doubt many of the Friends will enjoy but a Fool's Paradise.*

If a Fool's Paradise is the Fate of all those that speak improperly, I am satisfied J. S. will have a place there, from an Observation I have lately made on two Letters, &c. he writ to T. Robinson, in which I find such rare Grammar as this is, *Arguments has, Friends has*; Nominative Cases of the Plural, annexed to Verbs of the Singular Number. Is not this fine Syntax? And are not these delicate Teachers of others, who are so grossly ignorant of their Mother-Tongue.

P. 7. *Must a Man be in a State of Damnation, if he doth not know how to distinguish Numbers?*

I never heard any Man lay down such a Position, as this is; neither will we admit such *Innuendo's*, as Natural Consequences deducible from any of our Friends Words, till J. S. hath fully proved it, which we are confident he never can. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that our ancient Friends were moved by the Spirit of our Lord Jesus, not only to preach the Doctrine of the *plain Language* to others, but also to use it (tho' many times in much Self-denial) themselves; evidently foreseeing, they should thereby be exposed to the Satyr of Relations,

Scoffs

re- Scoffs of Associates, and bitter Revilings and
the Buffetings of Enemies. They were also con-
ing firmed in an Opinion, that the use of the Sin-
dof gular Number was their Duty, from the great
sh; opposition which so *trivial a thing*, as this is
Ss accounted by some, met with from the Spirit
of this World.

Nor are they our *Friends* only, that have been
concerned to write against this Corruption of
Language. For *Luther*, in his *Plays*, ridicules
it, saying, *Magister vos es iratus*; Master, you
are angry. *Erasmus*, in his Book *De Conscri-
bendis Epistolis*, calls it, *Consuetudo insulsissima*,
a most silly Custom; and sufficiently reprov-
es it. And *James Howel*, in his Epistle before
his *English and French Dictionary*, tells his Rea-
der the way how this abuse in Numbers
was at first introduced, and there affirms;
“ That both in *France* and other Nations, the
“ word (*Thou*) was used in speaking to one;
“ but by success of time, when the *Roman*
“ Commonwealth grew into an Empire, the
“ Courtiers began to magnifie the Emperor,
“ (as being furnished with Power to confer
“ Dignities and Offices) using the word (*You*)
“ yea, and Deifying him with more remarkable
“ Titles: Concerning which matter, we read
“ in the Epistles of *Symmachus* to the Emperors
“ *Theodosius* and *Valentinianus*, where he useth
“ these forms of speaking; *Vestra Aeternitas*,
“ Your Eternity; *Vestrum Numen*, Your God-
“ head; *Vestra Serenitas*, Your Serenity; *Vestra*
“ *Clementia*, Your Clemency. So that the word
“ (*You*) in the Plural Number, together with
“ other Titles and Compellations of Honour,
C “ seem

“ seem to have taken their rise from Monarchi-
 “ cal Government, which afterwards by de-
 “ grees came to be derived to private Persons
 By this it is apparent, that Court-Parasites
 (who were subject to Deify their Princes) were
 the first Introducers of this Stile. Of what
 advantage then an Apology for the *Vossators*
 or *Youers*, will be to the Christian Religion,
 leave to the Unbyassed to determine.

p. 7.

*The Quakers Conceits about their Habits and
 Dresses, the Effects of a gross and unaccountable
 Superstition.*

These words, in my opinion, are Elliptical,
 here being no *Copula* expressed, whereby the
 Subject, *The Quakers Conceits about their Habits
 and Dresses*, are united with the Predicate, *The
 Effects of a gross and unaccountable Superstition*.
 To speak properly, this Sentence should run
 thus: *The Quakers Conceits about their Habits
 and Dresses, are the Effects of a gross and un-
 accountable Superstition*. Seeing this Rector takes
 the liberty of using the Figure *Ellipsis*, I con-
 ceive he cannot justly condemn us, if some of
 our Friends have made use of the same Mode
 of Speech, which he hath here done.

How Magisterially doth this Man affirm
 That *the Quakers Conceits about their Habits and
 Dresses, are the Effects of a gross and unaccount-
 able Superstition*; tho' he hath not produced
 one Evidence out of their Books to confirm
 this Assertion? I am perswaded, that the Pas-
 sages which he represents, as *G. Fox's*, when
 taken in his sense, will appear to be our, and
 every real Christian's Duty: I say *represents*
 because *J. S.* takes Passages out of one of our
 Opposer's

Opposer's Books, and represents them as *G. F.*'s Sentiments, on the single Testimony of an Adversary, who quotes no Page nor Book, wherein *G. Fox* hath so expressed himself. Nevertheless this Anonymous* Author seems to have done *G. Fox* more Justice, in giving a large and continued Quotation (if I may so call it) than *J. S.* who hath only taken some shreds of it.

* *Christi.*
no En-
thus.
P. 121.

The Original of this *gross and unaccountable Superstition* (as he terms it) is only deduced from some Advice *G. F.* gave those, that were inclinable to follow the foolish Fashions of the World; and that all the Particulars mentioned by *J. S.* are such, I doubt not but these following Lines will demonstrate. The tendency of *G. F.*'s words; being, as *J. S.* saith, against *Unnecessary Buttons, Skimmingdish Hats, Slit-Peaks behind on the Skirts of the Womens Waistcoats, short Sleeves, and short black Aprons.*

The Sense of *G. F.* concerning these things, being more apparent from his words, as quoted by the Author of *Christianity no Enthusiasm*, than in this Treatise of *J. S.* I shall therefore in this place, recite and consider them, as they stand there. On these Heads *G. F.* begins his Discourse: *Friends, every where, admonish one another, young and old, that ye do not run after the World's Fashions, which are invented and set up by the vain and light Mind.* This is good and sound Advice, fit for all real Christians to follow, and consentaneous to the Doctrines delivered in the Scriptures, and such as the Primitive Christians preached in their Sermons, and confirmed by their

Lives and Actions: These were not like too many of your Ministry, whose Actions are a reverse to the Doctrines they deliver. G. F. goes on, *Away with your Skimmingdish Hats, and your unnecessary Buttons on your Coats and Cloaks, and on the tops of your Shoulders behind, and on your Sleeves.* Who but a degenerate Plant, would call these wholesome Admonitions, *The Effects of a gross and unaccountable Superstition?* I am satisfied (whatever J. S's Conceits may be) that the truly Religious of all Christian Societies will not vindicate the use of *unnecessary Buttons* on any part of their Cloaths; much less those that should wear them on the tops of their Shoulders behind. No doubt but such as should wear their Buttons now on the tops of their Shoulders behind, would be esteemed, by the generality, Men rather crazed in their Understandings, than Fashion-mongers. Notwithstanding the Ridiculousness of this Fashion, our Friend must be accounted *Superstitious* for speaking against it. Can it be imagined, that any Body, but a *Country-Parson*, would condemn a Man, as *Superstitious*, for advising his Friends, Not to run from one Extream to another, viz. from wearing Hats, whose Brims were so large, that they must have Stays to support them, to others, whose Brims were so narrow, that they would be of little or no use to the Wearer? He continues his Discourse, and saith, *Away with your long slit Peaks behind on the Skirts of your Waistcoats,* (Who is there, except J. S. that can write a Panegyrick in Vindication of this Beau-Fashion?) *and short Sleeves, punishing your Shoulders, so as you cannot have the use of* your

your Arms. The Woman that pleads for this Dress, must certainly be an Enemy to her own Ease. Had not J. S. appeared as an Advocate for it, I am perswaded, neither his Wife, nor any other Woman in this Kingdom, would defend its Cause. The last particular, from whence J. S. concludes that our Friends are guilty of an *unaccountable Superstition*, is from G. F's saying, *Away with your short black Aprons.* Prithee John, tell me what hurt would ensue, if a Minister of your Society should advise his Flock, to Cloath themselves with Modest Apparel, and not to put on any thing Superfluous, only because 'tis the Alamode Fashion? For these *short black Aprons*, which G. F. here reprehends, had the Name, tho' not the Qualities, requisite to an Apron. At the Foot of this Friendly Caution, G. F. fums up the matter in these words: *And so set not up, nor put on, that which you did once with the Light condemn; but in all things be plain, that you may adorn the Truth of the Gospel of Christ, and judge the World: And keep in that which is Comely and Decent.* How wittily soever the Libertines of this Age may plead against this Wholsom Advice, we sincerely desire, that we may be Followers of it; not doubting, but we shall have entire Satisfaction therein, when we shall be summoned to leave this Tabernacle of Clay.

If a Man must be represented, as guilty of *gross and unaccountable Superstition*, for advising his Friend to put on *Comely and Decent Apparel*, without restricting them to this Form, or that Fashion, only in general, that it may be *Comely and Decent*; what Name shall we give those

People, who enjoyn all their Fraternity to a
 Set Form of Habits, whereby they must ap-
 pear *Singular*? How culpable the *Church of*
England, so called, is in this matter, a Quo-
 tation taken out of their *Canons and Constitu-*
tions Ecclesiastical, will demonstrate: In the
 Seventy Fourth Canon I find these words, *viz.*
 " We do constitute and appoint, that the Arch-
 " Bishop and Bishops shall not intermit to use
 " the accustomed Apparel of their Degrees.
 " Likewise, all Deans, Masters of Colledges,
 " Arch-Deacons and Prebendaries in Cathe-
 " dral and Collegiate Churches, (being Priests
 " or Deacons) Doctors in Divinity, Law and
 " Physick, Batchelors in Divinity, Masters of
 " Arts, and Batchelors of Law, having any
 " Ecclesiastical Living, shall usually wear Gowns
 " with *standing Collars* and *Sleeves*, strait at the
 " Hands, or wide Sleeves, as is used in the
 " Universities, with Hoods or Tippetts of Silk,
 " or Sarcenet and square Caps; and that all
 " other Ministers admitted, or to be admitted
 " into that Function, shall also usually wear the
 " like Apparel, as is aforesaid, except *Tippetts*
 " only. We do further in like manner ordain,
 " That all the said Ecclesiastical Persons above-
 " mentioned, shall usually wear in their Jour-
 " neys, *Cloaks* with Sleeves, commonly called
 " *Priests Cloaks*, without *Gards*, *Welts*, *long But-*
 " *tons* or *Cuts*: And no Ecclesiastical Person
 " shall wear any *Coif*, or wrought *Night-Cap*,
 " but only plain *Night-Caps*, of *black Silk*, *Sat-*
 " *ten*, or *Velvet*. — In private Houses, and in
 " their Studies, the said Persons Ecclesiasti-
 " cal may use any Comely or Scholar-like Ap-
 " parel,

“ parel, provided that it is not *cut* or *pinckt* ;
 “ and that in publick they go not in their
 “ *Dubler* and *Hose*, without *Coats* or *Cassocks*,
 “ and that they wear not any *light-coloured*
 “ *Stockings*. Consider these Injunctions, and
 tell me, whether G. F. for saying, *Away with*
your Skimmingdish Hats, unnecessary Buttons, &c.
 or the Authors of these *Canons* (who do con-
 stitute and appoint some particular Forms of
 Apparel for their whole Society, and condemn
 others, as *Linnen Night-Caps, long Buttons, light-*
coloured Stockings, &c.) are the most Supersti-
 tious? Their Predecessors, who lived in the first
 Ages of Christianity, had no Singularities in
 their Apparel, whereby they might be dis-
 criminated from the rest of their Brethren ;
 and when these Superstitious Conceits about
 particular Habits and Dresses began to bud
 amongst them, it was severely reprehended
 even by the Bishops of *Rome* ; as is demonstra-
 ble from the Writings of Pope *Cælestine*, an
 Author of the Fifth Century, who very pathet-
 tically reproves the Practice of some Bishops,
 that apparelled themselves after a particular
 manner : “ We must (*saith he*) make our selves
 “ remarkable for our Wisdom, Prudence and
 “ Purity, not by our Garb and Cloathing ; we
 “ must teach the Faithful, and give them a
 “ good Example by our Lives, and not impose
 “ upon them by outward Shews ; we ought not
 “ to seek how to please their Eyes, but to fill
 “ their Minds with Divine Precepts.

He (G. F.) gave out rare Orders, about un- p. 3.
 necessary Buttons, Skimmingdish Hats, &c. and
 was very diligent in instructing his Followers in
 these,

these, and such like Essential Points of his Religion.

G. F.'s diligence in instructing his Followers in the Knowledge of the *Credenda*, and in the Practice of the *Agenda*, of the Christian Religion is apparent from his Writings, &c. but that he made any External, Essentials of his (i.e. Christian) Religion, we shall desire J. S. to prove; till then, we shall not admit his *Ipsi dixit*, without other Testimonials conclusive. Nevertheless, we do highly value and approve of his Christian Advice concerning *Modest and Decent Apparel*; and do heartily desire, that all our Friends would not be only Nominal, but Real Followers of him therein. What his genuine Thoughts are, concerning *unnecessary Buttons*, &c. in the preceding Pages I have fully demonstrated; to which I refer the Christian Reader.

p. 8. *Not new Looks or Habits, or an odd Dress, or any Singularity in our Carriage (as the Quakers dream) that Christianity requires.*

If by *new Looks*, J. S. means a vain and airy one, we grant his Assertion; but if by *new Looks*, he intends a sober and serious one, we deny it. If *new Habits* respects only those that are made according to the Gay and Beau Fashions, we subscribe to it; but if his Intention is thereby to incourage (as the drift of this Section seems to be) his Readers in their Conforming themselves to every Fashion, that comes in Vogue, we unanimously oppose it. If by an *odd Dress*, he means a *modest and decent Dress*, without any Superfluity, we dissent from him therein; but if by an *odd Dress*, he aims

at a singular sort of a Garb, such as the decimating *Levites* of our Age do generally wear, we readily grant it. Neither do we encourage a singular and affected Carriage in any; nor condemn those that have a liberal Education, provided their Behaviour in all things is such, as becomes a Follower of a Crucified Jesus.

He continues his Discourse: *Therefore it is a great Violation of Charity, and not judging Righteous Judgment, to condemn All, without distinction, as guilty of Pride and Vanity, for wearing only a little Ribbon, or some of that same thing, called Lace.* P. 8.

I do not perceive any Reason here is for annexing the Pronoun *same*, to *thing*; nor can I observe any Antecedent whereto, according to the exact Rules of Grammar, the word *same* doth relate; if J. S. will tell me, I shall take it as a Favour. The Falsity of this Rector's Insinuation here, is obvious to all, who have been curious to inspect our Actions, in representing us, as *Condemning all, without distinction, as guilty of Pride and Vanity, for wearing only a little Ribbon.* For should we condemn all, without any distinction, we should condemn our own Friends; because several of our Men wear Ribbon-Hatbands, and our Women commonly wear Ribbon for their Girdles, and on their Dust-Gowns, &c. Our daily Practice being contrary to J. S.'s positive Assertion, is a sufficient Confutation thereof. What we condemn in the *wearing of Ribbons*, is, when 'tis made of various Gay Colours, or mixed with Gold and Silver Thread; or when 'tis used for Ornament only, to please the vain Mind in any.

any. Neither do we conclude solely, from a Man or Woman's *wearing of Lace*, that they are guilty of Pride; yet we are satisfied, that it was invented for the Gratification of a vain and proud Mind; and that it will be (as it often hath been) the Burden of many truly Sensible Ones. These Motives have induced us to renounce the use thereof.

P. 8.

A well-dressed Head is no surer a sign of a Cardinal Mind, than a Bob-Cravat, and a Coat with few Buttons, are the certain Badges of an humble and true Christian Spirit.

Against whom these Arrows are darted, do not peceive. Had any of our Friends let drop any Positions like these, no doubt but J. S. would have exposed them: But he having not here produced the least Shadow of Proof, from any of our Friends Writings wherein they have asserted, That a *Bob-Cravat* and a *Coat with few Buttons*, are the certain Badges of a true Christian Spirit: I shall therefore consider this Insinuation, only as a Creature of his own Brain. It was never our method to square Mens Religions only by their Garbs; neither are the Men of our Society restricted to *Bob-Cravats*, as his Fraternity is to *Bob-Bands*: For some of our Friends use *Cravats*, others *Bands*, and a great many wear *Neckcloths*. Hence it may be concluded, that we do not appropriate any Sanctity to a *Bob-Cravat*. Tho' we do not confine any to a particular sort of Cloathing, as the Church of England, so called, doth; yet we advise all to shun Superfluities in Apparel, and to adorn their Bodies with Comely and Decent Dresses, as becomes the Followers of Jesus Christ.

I would

I would not be understood by this, to justify the Fantastick Dresses and Modish Vanities of our modern Beaus, even of both Sexes; but would only vindicate the unconcerned and unaffected Compliance of Sober and Vertuous Persons, with the decent Habits, and if you will, Fashions of the Age. P. 9.

Neither do I say (whatever I may think) that J. S. is an Advocate for the *Fantastick Dresses and Modish Vanities of our modern Beaus*: No, no; 'tis for the *Fantastick Dresses and Modish Vanities of our former Beaus*, that this Rector now appears. What the particular Dresses are, that J. S. comprehends under these Generals, *Fantastick Dresses and Modish Vanities*; wherein these agree, and wherein they differ from the Dresses he includes in the terms, *Decent Habits and Fashions of the Age*, I cannot divine. Till he shall please to express himself more intelligibly, and specify all the Singulars included under these General Terms, I shall wave the farther Consideration thereof.

Serve God, and love your Neighbour; look well to the inward Frame and Disposition of your Minds; govern your Passions; be Peaceable, Modest and Humble, &c. P. 9.

Would J. S. seriously reflect on this good Advice, I doubt not but he would apparently see, that his Actions are opposite to it: Because telling of Untruths, perverting of our Friends Sense, and giving their Words a Turn, quite different from their Intent and Meaning, is no Indication of a *Christian Spirit* in any. His endeavours to excite the Civil Magistrate against his Peaceable Neighbours, by misrepresenting them, is no demonstration of any real

real Love. There is no great harmony between, *Look well to the inward Frame and Disposition of your Mind, and Follow the Fashions of the Age: Govern your Passions*; tho' I am guided in Writing this Treatise by the worst of them even by *Malice and Envy: Be Peaceable*; tho' I am for Contention: *Be Modest*; tho' I have been Advocating the Cause of those that dress themselves according to the Modes in vogue *Be Humble*; tho' I am for receiving Honour Respect, and affect Greatness.

P. 10. *Our Blessed Saviour was not distinguished, as the proud Pharisees were, from the rest of the Jews, &c.*

We are also of opinion, that Jesus Christ his Apostles and Evangelists, were not to be known from the rest of their Neighbours (that Cloathed themselves decently and modestly) by any singular Habit or Dress, as the *Priests* now are; neither did they, as the proud *Pharisees* then and now do, conceive, that there is more Sanctity in one sort of Dress, than in another: Neither can we find, that they left any Canons behind them, prohibiting the decent use of *Quilted Night-Caps, and light-coloured Hose, &c.* tho' they have against *Excess in Apparel*.

1 Tim. 2.
5, 9, 10.
1 Pet. 3.3

We do not incourage a *lowre Look, or a fallen Countenance*, whatever my Opponent insinuates, near the foot of this Section, in any of our Friends; neither do we believe, that *stiff Carriages, or starched Behaviours*, are any *Essentials of Christianity*; neither is it our opinion, that *Courtesie, Civility, and good Manners*, are any ways inconsistent with the *true Principles of the Christian Religion*.

What

What I have already said, is enough to expose P. II.
 that rude and clownish Deportment of the Quakers
 towards their Betters, in denying all Civil Re-
 spect.

By what the Rector hath already said, it is
 not obvious to me, that he hath, by any In-
 stances produced, proved that we deny *all Civil*
Respect to our Betters; unless all *Civil Respect* to our
 Betters, consists in saying *You* to one Person,
 and in following the Fashions of the Age:
 These being the two Particulars objected against
 us, as Errors, in his former Sections; if he will
 tell me what precise determinate Ideas he in-
 cludes under complex Terms, *All Civil Respect*,
 and *Our Betters*, he need not doubt of a par-
 ticular Answer thereto. As long as our De-
 portment is consentaneous to the Mean of the
 Primitive Christians, we are not careful how
 rude or clownish it may appear in the Eyes of
 the Beaus, or of their Patrons.

If the Custom of the Country does require, as for P. II.
 Instance, the taking off the Hat, as a Mark or
 Token of that Respect, which is due by the Laws
 of our Religion; whoever refuses thus to take
 it off, offends both against the Laws of God and
 Man.

His Intention (if I may guess at it by his
 words) in this Passage seems to be, That
 if the Custom of the Country requires the
 taking off the Hat to Man, as a Mark or
 Token of that Respect, which is due, by the
 Laws of our Religion, to Man; whoever refuses
 thus to take it off to his Fellow-Creature,
 offends both against the Laws of God and Man:
 If this is his Sense, I then desire him to prove
 the

the Antecedent, viz. That the *Laws of our Religion* enjoin us to *take off our Hats to Man* which I am satisfied he never can do : Or he meaning from the fore-cited words, is that, the Custom of the Country requires the *taking off the Hat to Man*, tho' it is a Mark or Token of that respect, which is due, by the *Laws of our Religion*, to God ; whoever refuses to take it off to Man, offends both against the *Laws of God and Man* : If the Custom of the Country is to be reputed the Standard, whereby we are to direct our Actions in paying *Respect* to our Superiours ; then, where it requires *Divine Honours*, (as was usually given at *Rome*, to the Emperors) we must not omit giving it them because it was customary there so to do. Do not J. S. hereby condemn the Act of *Daniel*, praying to his God, when there was a Decree made against it ; the Refusal of *Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego*, to act as their Neighbours did ; and the Denial of the *Apostles* and *Primitive Christians* to give *Divine Honours* to Mortals, tho' it was Customary for the *Romans* to do, amongst whom they lived ? Some may possibly object, That *taking off the Hat to Man* is not giving him *Divine Honour*. Let such consider, that *uncovering the Head*, is required of us in our Worshipping of God, 1 Cor. 11. Seeing we are enjoined by the holy Scripture to *uncover our Heads* in our Worship to God and by the Custom of our Country, to *Man* the difficulty then will be, how we may know seeing the outward Act is the same, when it is given as a sign of *Divine Honour*, and when it is given as a token of *Civil Respect* ; let its Ad-

vocate

vocates demonstrate. If they will say, that it is the Intent of the Agent, and not the Act, abstractly considered, that determines it either Good or Evil: Let them consider, that this is a delicate Argument for the *Popish Adoration of Images*.

His following words are: *For Disrespect and Irreverence to those above us, are really Levelling Principles*. P. 11.

We may admit, that *Disrespect and Irreverence to those above us, are really Levelling Principles*; yet we do not conceive, that *not taking off the Hat to our Superiours*, can be esteemed a *Levelling Principle*; because in several Nations it is not customary to *take off the Hat* to any, and yet in these places the Inhabitants are no more *Levellers*, than in this Country. Tho' they do not take off their Hats to their *Superiours*, yet the Great Men are as easily distinguished from the Commonalty, as here. In *Africa* I have seen a Native come before a King, without using the Ceremony of the *Hat*; but when he paid his Respect to his Prince, he fell down on his Knees, and bowed his Head to the Ground. This Custom we as little approve of, as that of *taking off the Hat*. Was the Rector there, he must, if he would act according to his own Principles, act so too, because the Custom of the Country required it.

The Quakers pretend, tho' they don't use the Ceremony of the *Hat*, yet they pay Honour to whom Honour is due; but why don't they pay that Honour which is required? P. 12.

We do not only pretend to pay Honour, to whom Honour is due; but really do it, as far as it

it doth not clash with the Commands of our God. The greatest Honour, according to our Sentiments, that we can pay our *Superiours*, is a Cheerful Obedience to their Lawful Commands; which, according to our Principles, we are obliged to do; and a passive Submission to the Penalties of those Acts, which, with a serene and quiet Conscience, we cannot comply with. The Reason, *why we do not pay that Honour which is required*, is, because it is part of that outward Worship, which we are commanded to give our God, when we meet together to wait upon Him in our publick Assemblies: We dare not pay the same Respect to Man, that we do to God; nor place God and Man in the same Category.

I Cor.
II. 4.

P. 12.

They (i. e. the Quakers) require this very Token of Respect themselves, which they, out of Conscience as is pretended, dare not give to others.

It is none of our method, to require a *Ceremonious* taking off the Hat from our Apprentices, &c. as a Token of that Respect, which we cannot give to others; let our *Adversaries* slyly insinuate what they can to the contrary. We do not absolutely prohibit the taking off the Hat, without a Limitation; for we approve of a *Religious*, and of an *Advantageous* taking off the Hat, and are daily in the Practice of it. 'Tis only the *Ceremonious* taking off the Hat that we Conscienciously scruple; we call that a *Religious* taking off the Hat, when it is done in Adoration to God in our publick Meetings or when we vocally desire his Blessing on those Creatures, which he is graciously pleased to afford us for our Food.

We stile that an *Advantageous taking off the Hat*, when it is done on account of some benefit that probably will ensue to him that doth it; either in respect of Health, or for the more convenient Learning of some Trade or Science. Beneficial it would be to all Persons, if they would habituate themselves to go without their Hats in their own Houses; by such a Custom, their Constitution would be render'd more capable of defending it self against the Injuries of the Air, &c. and they would not be so subject, on every alteration of the Weather, to Defluxions, &c. as now they are. I judge it absolutely necessary for *Boys* to be obliged, on account of their Health, to be uncovered, when they are within doors; and if *Girls* could be perswaded to go in their Hair, as Boys generally do, it would be advantageous to their Health.

Conveniency obliges most young People to be without their Hats, when they are learning any Art or Science, because it would be an Impediment to their Tutors. School-masters can inform any, how inconvenient it would be to them, if their Scholars should wear their Hats when they teach them to Read, Write, or Cast Accompts. For these and the like Reasons, and not for Honour or Respect, it is that our Children, Scholars and Apprentices go without their Hats, when they are at home. And we deny, that it is our Practice to Command our Servants or Inferiours to *stand with Cap in hand before us*, as J. S. falsely suggests: But if any of our Servants or Inferiours, that think the taking off the Hat, τὸ ἀδιάφορον, a thing indifferent, will give us that Respect, which they

D

imagine

imagine is their Duty to give our Equals, we do not require it of them, nor justifie them therein. We hate Hypocrisie, therefore countenance none in meerly imitating our Actions or Modes of Speech; neither is any Man's Person the more acceptable to us, because he doth, out of a Fantastick Humour, mimick our Language or Behaviour: We esteem those most, who appear what really they are.

P. 13. *The Friends are so Squeamish truly, that they are afraid to put off their Hats in the Presence of their Betters.*

This is a mistake; for we are no more afraid to take off our Hats in the Presence of our Betters, than any of our other Vestments. We do not condemn it, when 'tis for Health or Conveniency done, as aforesaid; nay, we do it as often as our Hats would be Incommodious to us; not regarding whether we are in the company of our Superiours or Inferiours.

A few Lines under the former words, he saith *The Friends are never against receiving Respect* (i. e. of the Hat.)

This is false; for many of our *Friends* advise those, that would stand before them uncovered To put on their Hats; telling them, that they do not expect such Ceremonies.

P. 14. *Fox Blasphemously called himself the Son of God.—For the Proof of this, I shall only Instance in that Answer which he gave to Oliver Cromwell, that he would not fight with the Carnal Sword which begins thus, viz. I who am of the World called George Fox, do deny the carrying or drawing of any Carnal Sword against any, or against thee Oliver Cromwell, or any Man, in the Presence of*

the Lord God I declare it, God is my Witness, by whom I am moved to give this forth for the Truth's sake, from him whom the World calls George Fox; who is the Son of God, who is sent to stand a Witness against all Violence.

These words, as here cited, have a difficulty in them. In order therefore to mitigate their seeming harshness, I shall leave these Severals to be considered.

First; As to the Credibility of this pretended Letter, we have nothing but our Adversaries bare Assertion, that they have a Copy of it: If they had the Original, written or signed by G. Fox, they might gain some Credit to their Innuations; but as long as their Credentials are highly Suspicious, having no better a Support, than a pretended Copy, which is only in the hands of our Adversaries, it will, I hope, have the less Credibility with the Unprejudiced. My Author here seems to quote *The Snake in the Grass* for it; the *Snake* cites *F. Bugg's New Rome Arraigned*: It is not impossible nor improbable, but that *F. B.* may be the Author of it, because he hath forged several things, viz. *A Tryal, A Sermon, A Dialogue, &c.* in our Names; which are the genuine Off-spring of his own Brain.

Secondly; Because the pretended Quotations do not exactly agree: The Fragment that is produced by the *Snake*, p. 113. hath not these words, for the Truth's sake, as *J. S's* hath. Had it been genuine, no doubt but the *Snake* would have been more exact, than to have left out four words in such a Quotation as this is.

Thirdly; We may very Rationally suppose, if this was *G. F's* Letter, that he concluded it

with these words, *From him whom the World calls G. Fox*; and a Postscript might begin with the following Sentences, *Who is the Son of God? He who is sent to stand a Witness against all Violence*: thereby alluding to the words of Christ to Peter, *Put up thy Sword into its place*, Mat. 26. 52. and to the Soldiers, *Do Violence to no Man*, Luke 3. 14. To those that shall object, That the Pronoun *He* is not the Original: My answer is Prove it. But if they reply, It is not in our Copy: Let them consider, that it is as possible for a careless or invidious Transcriber to omit the term *He*, as for the *Snake* to leave out *four words* together.

What I have already urged against the Validity of this *Letter*, may be esteemed a sufficient Vindication of *G. F.* from the Imputation of *Blasphemy*: Nevertheless, to satisfy such as are subject to believe, that this is a Real, and no Fictitious Shred of a Letter, which *G. F.* sent to *Oliver Comwell*, I shall consider it

Lastly, For Argument sake, as a *Genuine Piece* and shall wave all my former Objections against it; and admit, that *G. F.* did, in a lax sense term himself the *Son of God*; barely from such an admission, I am perswaded it will be beyond the abilities of *J. S.* from thence to prove *G. F.* a *Blasphemer*; because the *Son of God* is predicated in holy Writ of various Subjects. Man is called the *Son of God* by *Creation*, by *Adoption*, and by *Profession*: Jesus Christ is the *Son of God* by *Nature*, according to his *Godhead*; by *Wonderful Union*, according to his *Manhood*.

By *Creation*, *Adam* is called the *Son of God* Luke 3. 38. *Which was the Son of Adam, which*

was the Son of God. By Adoption, the Saints are called the Sons of God, Rom. 8. 14. As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God: If all that are led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God, then every Numerical Person, that is led by the Spirit of God, is the Son of God. By Profession, those that are Born of Godly Parents, have the Title of Sons of God given them, Gen. 6. 2. The Sons of God saw the Daughters of Men, &c. In these Senses a true Christian may be called The Son of God, without the horrid Imputation of Blasphemy. And if G. F. did ever assert, that he was the Son of God, it was in some of these Qualified Senses; because we that knew him, are sensible, that he abominated the glorious Title of the Son of God, in the sense it is singularly predicated of Jesus Christ. The Ancients gave the Title of the Son of God to the Regenerate, as is undeniable from a Passage of Tertullian, in his Book *De Pudicitia*; his words are, *Hec non admittet omnino, qui Natus a Deo fuerit; non futurus Dei Filius, si admiserit*: "He that is Born of God, will not commit such Sins as these; he shall not be the Son of God, if he do commit them.

The Idolatrous Practices of the Quakers, in worshipping G. F. proved from undeniable Instances. P. 16.

For the Proof of this false Assertion, he takes a single Quotation out of the *Snake*, whom he calls an *Authentick Author*. The Credibility of his Stories, *J. Wyeth* hath sufficiently exposed in his *Switch*; but because *J. S.* insults over him, on account of his Answer to this Passage, I shall consider it here, and offer the following Particulars

culars in our Friend's Vindication. First, I shall repeat the Snake's words, as J. S. hath quoted them, and then answer them disjunctively ;
 P. 17. which are, That he (i. e. the Snake) had it from Eye-witnesses, who have seen the Quakers fall down to G. F. and saying to him, Thou art the Son of the Everliving God, the King of Israel ; all Nations shall worship thee, &c. And kneeling to his Wife Margaret, gave her an Ora pro nobis in these words, O thou my heavenly Mother, pray to my heavenly Father for me. These Adorations were common to G. F. And that Blasphemous Vulpone took it gravely, without any reprehension ; but on the contrary, with delectation, stroking his Hand over their Faces, as his custom was, who kneeled or fell prostrate before him. But because the Friends call always for an Instance, tho' the Case be never so common, I will, to oblige them, go a great way back, and name Ann Gargil, who, when G. F. came first to London, threw her self upon her Knees, betwixt his Feet, and cryed out to him, Thou art the Son of the Living God. S. B. another Quaker, now alive, was present, and confesses, she was struck with that Blasphemous Expression.

Let these Eye-witnesses be produced, that saw the Quakers fall down to G. Fox, and salute him with, Thou art the Son of the Everlasting God, the King of Israel ; all Nations shall worship thee, &c. We provoke him to Name his Witnesses, and the Quakers that gave G. Fox these Titles ; we crave no favour at his hands : If he doth not nominate them, we shall enumerate these Suggestions amongst the rest of the Snake's Forgeries.

With

With an Assurance peculiar to our Adversaries in telling Untruths, the *Snake* affirms, That *those Adorations were common to G. F.* As to the Falsity of this Story, I appeal to *Keith* and *Bagg*, two formerly of ours, now of *G. S's* Society, whether they were ever present when any of our Friends gave *G. F.* or any other, such Titles on their Knees; if it was common, no doubt but they can tell, seeing they were so long conversant with us. For my self, I do solemnly declare, that tho' my Parents were *Friends* (and it may be, none of the meanest amongst them) with whom *G. F.* was intimately acquainted, and I always Educated by them in the Ways of *Truth*; yet I never saw nor heard of any Adorations given to *G. F.* till I met with this Passage. Who can imagine, that is not byassed by the blackest Malice, that we, who had a Personal Knowledge of *G. F.* and were often in his company, should be ignorant of his daily Practices, and should never have seen nor heard of such common Actions, till an *Adversary* should advise us thereof, *Credat Judæus apella?*

His following words are, *And that Blasphemous Vulpone took it gravely, without any reprehension; but on the contrary, with delectation, stroking his hand over their faces (as his custom was) who kneeled, or fell prostrate before him.*

We provoke the *Snake*, and the *Rector* his Follower, to produce one single Instance, from whom *G. F.* received these *Adorations* gravely, without any Reprehension, much less with Delectation, as the *Snake* affirms; or that he stroked his Hand over such Creatures Heads,

who kneeled, or fell prostrate before him.

He goes on insultingly, *But because the Friends call always for an Instance, tho' the case be never so common, I will, to oblige them, go a great way back, and name Ann Gargil, who, when G. F. came first to London, threw her self upon her Knees betwixt his Feet, and cryed out to him, Thou art the Son of the Living God.*

To rescue our Friends from the horrid Imputation of giving or receiving *Divine Adoration*, I shall leave the following Particulars to the Readers Consideration.

First; We acknowledge, that about the Year 1655. there were a Set of Women tinctured with the *Spirit of Ranterism*, who would give Honours to the Creature, more proper for their Creator: These our Friends unanimously rejected, except *James Naylor*, who not minding the Gift of God in himself, was deluded by them: He and his Followers were denied by G. F. and the rest of our Friends; and for that Act discarded their Society. *J. N.* at length being reduced to a sense of his Delusions, made a Publick Recantation, condemning both himself and his Abettors therein.

Secondly; The Reason, in my opinion, that induced the *Snake* to go so far back, was, because he could meet with no shadow of an Instance nearer; and considering the Fact was transacted about Fifty Years since, it might be rationally supposed, that all the Persons then present, are now dead, whereby this circumstantiated Story might pass the easier undiscovered. And no doubt, if all that had any

know-

knowledge of that Act of *A. G.* had been so, but the *Snake* would have been as dogmatical in his Positions, as if he had seen all the Circumstances transacted.

Thirdly; As to *Ann Gargil*, she was a *Ranter*, and reputed as such, before the time that it's said, She fell on her Knees in the presence of *G. F.* and continued in their *Practices* afterwards; yet would intrude her self sometimes into our *Friends Company*, till she was publicly disowned by them, which was a few Weeks after. We esteem our selves no more answerable for this Creature's Actions, than *J. S.* is accountable for his *Authentick Author's* Machinations against the late Government.

Fourthly; We deny that *G. F.* did stroke his Hand over *Ann Gargil's* Head, as the *Snake's* *Inquendo's* seem to conclude.

Fifthly; *S. B.* told me, that *A. G.* did not throw her self between *G. F's* Feet.

Sixthly; *S. B.* is not positive, that *A. G.* did, on her Knees, utter these words, *Thou art the Son of the Living God.*

Were not these Objections sufficient to invalidate *J. S's* Inferences from the *Snake's* Promises, I could have advanced several other Arguments; but this Relation being so notoriously larded with Untruths, the very nominating two or three of them, is certainly enough to nauseate any Religious Palates, and render the whole suspicious; therefore they are at present omitted. Had not *J. S.* been mightily put to for an Instance of these *Quaker-Adorations*, as he calls them, doubtless he would never have rested satisfied, in producing the Act of a *Ranter*, as the only Proof thereof.

In

P. 17.

In the middle of the Citation, it's said, *And kneeling to his Wife Margaret, gave her an Ora pro nobis, in these words, O thou my heavenly Mother, pray to my heavenly Father for me.*

Concerning the Names of those Persons, that gave *Margaret Fox* this *Ora pro nobis*, here is not one Syllable. Can it be imagined, if the *Snake* had any Instances of this nature, that he would have concealed them? If they were reputed *Quakers*, let them be named; but if they were *Ranters*, the naming of them would have marred his Cause: On this account, possibly, he exposed not their Names. I have discoursed with some of *M. Fox's* Children concerning this matter, and they do assure me, that they never saw any *Quaker* fall on their Knees to their Mother; much less say, *O thou my heavenly Mother, pray to my heavenly Father for me.*

P. 17.

Lest the Quakers should pretend these are Stories raised to slander Truth and its Friends; you must know, that all they can say, in excuse of these plain Instances of their Idolatrous Practices, is only this, VIZ. I do here charge the Snake, says Wyeth, with a notorious Lye, in saying, that G. F. did, with delectation, ever accept of any Adoration, or to the stiled King of Israel, &c.

Switch,
P. 182.

The *Quakers* do not only pretend, but can demonstrate, that these Stories are raised for no other intent or purpose, but to Slander *Truth* and its Friends. It may be concluded that this Rector hath a mighty Conceit of the Extensiveness of his own Knowledge, from his saying; *You must know, that all they can say, in excuse of these plain Instances of their Idolatrous Practices*

Practices, is only this, viz. I do here charge the Snake with a notorious Lye, in saying, That G. F. did, with delectation, ever accept of any Adoration, to be stiled King of Israel, &c. What I have said in the former Pages, is enough to convince the Impartial, that J. S. egregiously Romances, in affirming, that what J. Wyeth hath printed, is all that the Quakers can say in this case. No doubt but J. W. could have said much more: But it being the opinion of most, (perhaps it may be his also) that if any Rector of a matter of Fact is detected of Lying in any Circumstance, no Credit is to be given to the rest, till he can rescue himself from the imputation of a Liar; and J. W. having positively asserted, That the Snake was guilty of a notorious Lye, in affirming, that G. F. did, with delectation, ever accept of any Adoration, might think that a sufficient Confutation of the credibility of the whole Story.

Doth not this Minister, by saying, You must know, that all they can say, &c. take an Attribute of God? For what finite Creature can tell all that any Man can say on this or that Subject? None but our Creator knows the Thoughts of particular Persons, certainly then it is great presumption in the Rector positively to affirm, that this is all they (i. e. every numerical Quaker) can say, in excuse of these plain Instances. Where these plain Instances of the Quakers Idolatrous Practices are, I cannot tell; I have, with some attention, read this Section over and over, with expectation of finding them there; but, to my satisfaction, I lost my labour. And there seems to be something extraordinary in this Man's

Man's Conclusions ; for who but J. S. would argue after this manner? J. W. hath said no more on this Subject here, therefore he can say no more: Or thus, A *Quaker* hath advanced no other Argument against this Assertion of the *Snake*, therefore no *Quaker* can advance any other Argument, &c. Is not this a rare Logician, that can from a particular, deduce an universal Conclusion?

Four Lines under the former Passage, he argues much after the same method, in saying *They (i. e. the Quakers) cannot deny, you see, that Fox used to be worshipped and adored.*

The Premises from whence he makes this Inference, he subjoyns in the following words viz. *Because Wyeth hath not a word to say against that. J. W. hath not said a word against this therefore the Quakers cannot.* O fine Logick *Risum teneatis amici?*

P. 20. *He that considers the strange Wilfulness of the Quakers, in denying Civil Titles, would be almost apt to imagine, that they had found out some plain Texts of Scripture, where God had expressly forbidden us to give any Marks of Honour and Respect.*

I do not conceive why any Person should be apt to imagine, from our Consciencious Refusal of giving some *Civil Titles*, (as J. S. calls them) that we had found out some plain Text of Scripture, where God had expressly forbidden us to give *any Marks of Honour or Respect*. It is sufficient for us, if we can produce a plain Text of Scripture, where Christ hath expressly forbidden us to give that *Title*, which this *Reverend* pleads for, and we scruple; tho' we do

not cite any Scripture, where God hath expressly forbidden us to give *any Marks of Honour* or *Respect*.

The principal Instance produced here by my Adversary, of our denying *Civil Titles*, is from a Consciencious Refusal in us of giving that flattering Title, *Master*, to those that are in no respect our *Masters*: To justify our selves in the non-observance of that vain Custom, we are satisfied that we have the positive Commands of Jesus Christ, who said, *Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ*; and in the tenth Verse, he corroborates his former Expression, by saying, *Neither be ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ*. Mat. 23.
8.

We are not against all *Civil Titles*, as my Opponent suggests; we scruple none of those that the *Apostles* and *Primitive Christians* gave, before the great Night of Apostacy deluged the Christian World. We oppose not the use of those, that any can justly claim either by Law, Office, or Nature; it is those that Flatterers, in their Addresses use, to gratifie a proud and vain Mind: And such as the Persons cannot truly and properly assume or appropriate to themselves, that we Conscienciously refuse: Our daily Practices may speak for us in this matter. Where was there any of our Friends that ever oppos'd the calling of a *Captain*, *Major*, *Colonel*, or *General*, by these Designations, provided they were by their *Military Places* Legally entituled to them? Who is there among us that doth not give the *Civil Magistrates* their proper Titles, as often as they have an occasion to use them, viz. *Constable*, *Justice*, *Sheriff*,

Sheriff, Mayor, Judge, &c. I never met with any of our Communion that scrupled to call any Man *Father, Master*, (that was either his real Father, or legal Master) *Esquire, Counsellor, Doctor of Law or Physick, Knight, Lord, Earl, Duke, Prince, King, &c.* as long as they had Lawful Right to them. By this it is evident that we do not deny all *Civil Titles*; and that *J. S's* Inference, from our denial of giving *Flattering Titles*, to conclude, we ought therefore to give none at all, is foolish and illogical.

We are for giving *Honour and Respect* to all Men, especially to the *Civil Magistrate*: The most Essential Part of that Respect and Honour which is due from us to our Superiours, in our opinion, doth not consist in speaking of false *Grammar*, or in taking off the Hat; but in loving them, and obeying their just and lawful Commands. In the latter, we can demonstrate, that we are not behind the rest of our Neighbours; with the former we cannot comply, for Reasons formerly assigned. If my Antagonist will be pleased hereafter to specify every numerical *Title*, which he comprehends under the indefinite terms *Civil Titles*, he may depend on our Reasons why we cannot oblige our Superiours with such Designations; till then, I shall not think it my Duty to consider this Subject much farther.

In the following Section, the *Rector* suggests that the Language of our Saviour, *Neither be ye called Masters*, does not respect the Custom that is amongst us, of giving the flattering Title *Master*, to those that are in no respect our Masters, in Salutations; but that the Meaning of this Command is:

Be ye not Masters, as the Pharisees and Jewish P. 23.
 Doctors are, who have usurped a Tyrannical Authority
 over the Consciences of their Followers; by
 which means, they are obliged implicitly to believe
 whatever they teach them, and are absolutely to
 resign themselves to their Conduct, as if they were
 infallible. Now this is such a Blind Obedience,
 that our Saviour expressly forbids his Disciples even
 to require it; and such a Despotick Power, that he
 will by no means allow them to exercise over one
 another.

This Exposition of the Text seems to be
 calculated principally against an Inconsiderate
 Act of some Quakers in Barbados; I say some,
 because many honest Friends there opposed
 it, and it was disliked by us here, and by
 those of our Communion in other parts of the
 World. We are no Favourers of a Blind Obe-
 dience in any; neither do we exercise a Des-
 potick Power over one another. According to
 our private Sentiments, we are not so culpa-
 ble in blindly following our Leaders, as my
 Adversary and his Fraternity are: To demon-
 strate this, so that it may be obvious to others,
 I shall first consider the Passage; from whence
 S. concludes, That they (i. e. the Quakers) P. 23.
 have given up themselves, Soul and Body, to the
 absolute Conduct and Management of their Leaders;
 and then expose the Despotick Power, which the
 Superiours of our National Church exercise
 over the Inferiour Ministry.

The Passage, from whence my Adversary
 would infer, that the Quakers are obliged Im-
 plicitly to believe whatever their Ministers
 teach them, runs in these words, viz. I desire P. 23.

to give up my whole Concern, if required, both Spiritual and Temporal, unto the Judgment of the Spirit of God in the Men and Womens Meetings. Had this Rector no other design, than the Exposing of the Quakers Errors, as he insinuates in his Introduction, certainly he would never have made this particular Act an universal Object of censure; because as soon as this Order came to the sight of G. Fox, it was censured by him; and he, in conjunction with George Whitehead and Alexander Parker, wrote to their Friends in Barbados, to stop this Paper from going any further, because they did not approve of the Doctrine therein contained; and Stephen Crisp wrote a Book principally against this Paper, where he tells his Reader, That he believed the Paper was not only ill worded, but ill meant by him that contrived or drew it up. Doth Christianity teach its Ministers to condemn a whole Society for the inconsiderate Actions of a few, when 'tis publicly oppugned by the rest? Is this doing as you would be done unto? Common Morality would even blush at such Invidious Deductions.

Had there been nothing in this Paper more repugnant to our Principles, than this Quotation, viz. *I desire to give up my whole Concern, if required, both Spiritual and Temporal, unto the Judgment of the Spirit of God in the Men and Womens Meetings*; it is very probable that our Friends would not have so earnestly opposed it, when it first appeared. For what hurt could accrue to any, from submitting their Affairs, whether Spiritual or Temporal, to the Judgment of the Spirit of God, in the Men or Womens Meetings,

or in a particular Person? Nay, I am so far from censuring my Friends, for their readiness to be guided by the *Spirit of God*, that I judge it my Duty implicitly to believe, That whatever the *Spirit of God* commands, is obligatory; let the Organ that delivers it be never so contemptible, provided he can persuade me that he is divinely Commissionated. But where *S's* Senses were, I cannot imagine, when he, from the fore-cited Premises, concluded, *Therefore they (i. e. the Quakers) have given up themselves, Soul and Body, to the absolute Conduct and Management of their Leaders*; unless he phantasies, that *Spirit of God* and *Leaders*, are equivalent terms.

Having thus briefly defended my *Friends* from the Imputation of *blindly following their Teachers*, I shall in the next place shew how culpable our *Accuser* and his *Fraternity* are in this very thing, viz. *In absolutely resigning themselves to the Conduct of their Superiours*; not to tire my Reader with many Instances, I shall at present only present him with one, which is contained in the Oath of *Canonick Obedience*, which the Ministers of the *Church of England* are obliged to take, when they are Ordained by their Bishop: The Form of it runs thus; **Ego A. B. iuro quod præstabo Veram & Canonickam Obedientiam Episcopo — ejusque Successoribus in omnibus iocitis & honestis, sic me Deus adjuvat*: "I *A. B.* do swear, that I will perform True and Canonick Obedience to the Bishop,—and to his Successors, in all things that are lawful and honest; so help me God. By Vertue of this Oath of *Canonick Obedience*, the Diocesan hath

* Bishop Sparrow's Collect. of Art, &c. P. 132.

his *Clergy* in an absolute Subjection; his *Despotick Authority* is so prevalent with them, that if he commands any of them to deliver this or that Person to the *Devil*, that is, to Excommunicate him, they are obliged, without demanding a Reason, to pronounce that Dismal Sentence. And as the Bishops assume a Power to determine what is *True* and *Canonick Obedience*, and what Particulars are included in these Generals, **All things that are Lawful and honest**; I cannot perceive where their Power terminates, and what Burthens they may not impose on the Necks of their *Curates*, &c. by reason of the various Senses, which may be given the Extensive Terms contained in this Oath.

I shall conclude this Chapter with the Saying of our Saviour; *Thou Hypocrite, first cast out the Beam out of thy own Eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the Mote out of thy Brother's Eye.*

Mat. 7. 5.

C H A P. II.

The Quakers Sentiments concerning the Light within vindicated, and the Objections against it invalidated.

IN my former Sheets, I have made an Essay to defend our *Practices* from the false Glosses and invidious Turns of my Adversary; how successful my Endeavours have been in that attempt, is left to the unbiassed Reader's determination. I shall now proceed to the Consideration of our *Principles*, desiring the assistance of Christ my Redeemer, to enable me to vindicate our *Friends*, and his *Blessed Truth*, from this Adversaries malicious Insinuations.

I shall make it appear, that **they** are quite different from those professed by the whole Christian World. P. 25.

This Passage is a little obscure, and seems not to be extraordinary Grammar; because there is in this Paragraph no visible Antecedent to the Relative **they**: If *they* relates to *Quakers*, it will run thus; *I shall make it appear, that they (Quakers) are quite different from those professed by the whole Christian World*; this is rare Sense: If *Principles* is the Antecedent, the Period is not then clearly worded. But waving these Grammatical Niceties, the Meaning of this sentence, by the Context, seems to be, That I will make it appear, that the *Principles* of the *Quakers* are quite different from those professed by

the whole Christian World. The *whole Christian World* is a place of a vast extent, and there is a great difficulty lies on those, that would only recite the different *Principles* of all the *Christians* in *Europe*; but to make it appear, that our *Principles* are quite different, from those professed by the *whole Christian World*, is a prodigious Undertaking. This is not yet done: therefore in his Reply I shall expect, according to his Promise, the performance thereof.

P. 26. *It is—freely and openly owned and acknowledged by themselves, that their Religion is not only different from what is professed in the Church of England, but also in all the Churches in Christendom.*

What but Malice in Perfection, could have instigated any Man, to publish such known Fallhoods! We provoke him to prove these Premises, because we are not sensible that any such Conclusions can be naturally deduced from the Passages, taken by him out of *E. Burroughs* Epistle to *G. Fox's Great Mystery*: To demonstrate that my Adversary hath done unjustly by our Friend, I shall leave these Severals to be considered.

P. 26. His first Quotation is out of an Epistle prefixed to *E. B's Works*, where he cites this Passage, viz. *And that we have sufficient cause to cry against them, and to deny their Ministry, their Church, their Worship, and their whole Religion.* Here the *Rector* like a prejudiced Person, breaks off in the middle of the Period: But *E. B.* goes on, and in the following words gives his Reasons, why he thinks he hath sufficient cause to cry against the *Priests*, and to deny their *Ministry*, their *Church*, their *Worship*, and the

whole Religion: As being not, saith he, in the Power, and by the Spirit of the Living God, as commanded of him, or ever practised by his Saints; but this declareth the Ground and Foundation hereof to be another thing, and not the same on which the true Church, and Ministry, and Practice, and Worship, and true Religion were builded in the days of the Apostles. After this General, he subjoyns in that Epistle several particular Motives, which induced him to deny their Ministry, viz. First, Because the National Ministers, were Hirelings, who made a Prey of their Hearers, and fed themselves with the Fat, and devoured Souls for dishonest Gain. Secondly, Because they were as rough Goats, in the nature of Swine, that are polluted in the filth of the World; and in the nature of Dogs and Lions, devouring one another, and biting one another, and killing one another; which things were not in the Churches of Christ. Thirdly, Because they run for Gifts and Rewards, and preached for filthy Lucre, and through Covetousness made Merchandize of Souls, seeking Money and Gain to themselves. Fourthly, Because they agree with the false Ministry, false Prophets, false Apostles, and Deceivers of old, in Call, Practice, and Maintenance: Fifthly, because they excited the Magistrates and the Commonalty to Persecution, by Lyes, false Oaths, and by suggesting that the Quakers were Deceivers, Witches, Seducers, Hereticks, Blasphemers, &c. Thus I have briefly deciphered some of the Qualities of the Priests, against whom E. B. there travelled his Discourse. Now let all sincere Christians determine, whether our Friend had

not a just cause to cry against such *Priests*, and to deny their *Ministry*, &c.

He spoke against their *Church*, because its zealous Members, by their Actions against the *Quakers*, seemed to have thrown off the common Principles of Morality: He did not approve of their Forms of *Worship*, because it was much degenerated from the Practices of the Christians in the *Apostles* days: He disliked their *whole Religion*, because the Power and Spirit of God did not accompany its Teachers.

The Second Instance, which J. S. produces as a Proof of our Religion not only differing from what is expressed in the Church of England but also in all the Churches of Christendom, from a Passage in the same *Epistle*, not far from its End, where E. B. expresses himself in the words: *Thou may'st fully perceive we differ in Doctrines and Principles; and the one thou may'st justifie, and the other thou must condemn, as being one clean contrary to the other, in our Principles*. I can scarce perswade my self, that any Man not blinded with Prejudice, would, after a deliberate Reading of the Context, have taken the Sentence *universally*; whereas by the foregoing words it is restricted to the Doctrines and Principles opposed by G. Fox in that particular Volume. To elucidate this matter more fully I shall quote some of his own words, in the same Paragraph, which are: "Here thou hast a Catalogue, and whole Number of Books printed and written against us, and **abundance of their Doctrines**, uttered against us, and in opposition to us, gathered up

“ this *Volume*, in a Sum, with our *Answers*
 “ to them ; and if thy Heart and Mind be
 “ single, thou may’st understand in measure
 “ the difference in Doctrine, between them
 “ and us, and compare each of them with the
 “ Scriptures ; and see whether their Doctrines
 “ and Principles, laid down as the Subjects of
 “ their Books ; or our Doctrines and Principles,
 “ laid down in Answer to theirs, be according
 “ and agree with the Scriptures, &c. Either
 “ let my Opponent advocate the Cause of these
 “ *Priests*, and defend all their Doctrines and Prin-
 “ ciples, which are Enumerated in the *Great My-*
 “ *stery*, and there Answered by *G. Fox* ; or else
 “ let him desist from throwing any more of his
 “ dirty Ink upon us.

The third and last Instance, which *J. S.* cites,
 is out of *Edward Burrough’s Works* : *And so all* P. 416.
you Churches and Sects, by what Name soever you
are known in the World, you are the Seed of the
great Whore. What our Friend here intends,
 by *All you Churches*, is apparent from his own
 words in the preceding Page, where he distin-
 guishes between the Members of the *True* and
False Churches of Christ : *The Members of the*
False Church, saith he, *are such as had been*
amongst the Members of the True Church, and
were once Convinced ; which had got the Form,
and put on Sheeps Clothing upon the Wolfish Na-
ture. These are the Churches and Sects he
 directs his Discourse against ; such as had the
 Form, but not the Power ; the Cloathing, but
 not the Nature of a Christian. Neither is the
 term *All* to be taken here Universally, be-
 cause he restricts it in the following Page :

As a Proof thereof, take his own words; *Thus I have to say, in all sorts of People, and amongst all those Sects amongst Papists and Protestants, and all Sects risen out of them, in Thousands of People, notwithstanding the Darkness, and all the Apostacy that hath ruled in general; yet in some of all Sorts and Sects, there hath been Sincerity and Simplicity, and a Desire and Zeal for God and of God, in them and amongst them.* Having thus briefly considered our Friend's Expressions, I shall now leave it to the Determination of the Unprejudiced; whether G. hath done us Justice, or made it appear that our Principles are quite different from those professed by the whole Christian World.

P. 26. Now this is not only the Opinion of one of the most noted Writers, styled a Son of Thunder and Consolation, a True Prophet and Faithful Servant of God; but his Works were approved and printed by the Order and Care of their Second Days Meeting.

Had this Man been present at the Second Days Meeting, and seen this Book approved of, and orders given by them for its printing, he could not have been more dogmatical, than he is, by positively affirming, That his (i. e. E. B's) Works were approved and printed by the Order and Care of the Second Days Meeting. Notwithstanding 'tis so confidently affirmed by him, I shall take the liberty to assert, that when this Book was printed, there was no such Meeting in Being, as the Second Days Meeting; and consequently J. hath published a notorious Untruth in Fact.

P. 28. Now the Quakers have always endeavoured to persuade their Followers, that G. FOX has made some notable Discoveries concerning the Light within,

which the World was altogether ignorant: And therefore they have told us, "That it pleased God ^{Switch,} to send forth his Servant G. F. who was of God ^{P. 37, 38.} made an Apostle in this Age, and hath been Instrumental in his hand, for the directing of Thousands to the Light of Christ in Men.

To know what Ten Thousand People, in many separate places, are always endeavouring to do, is beyond the capacity of any Mortal; yet J. S. hath the Presumption boldly to assert, That the Quakers have **always** endeavoured to persuade their Followers, &c. These sort of Romantick Positions are so common with my Adversary, that without the concurring Testimonies of others, I can scarce believe him when he speaks the Truth. What these notable Discoveries, that the Quakers have always endeavoured to persuade their Followers, that G. F. hath made concerning the Light within, of which the World was altogether ignorant, are, J. S. had done well to have particularized them, if he had thought they had merited our Observation. I know of no Discoveries that G. F. hath made concerning the Light within, but what are contained in the Holy Scriptures, and such as the Primitive Christians have left us in their Writings. Neither doth the Fragment taken out of the Switch, in my opinion, prove, That the Quakers have always endeavoured to persuade their Followers, that G. F. hath made some notable Discoveries concerning the Light within, of which the World was altogether ignorant; it only relates a Matter of Fact, viz. That God sent forth G. Fox, and he became Instrumental in his hand, for the directing of Thousands to the Light of Christ in Men. I am fully satisfied, that what

what the *Switch* hath there said, is true : But why J. S. should infer from those Premises, that G. F. hath made some *notable Discoveries concerning the Light within, of which the World was altogether ignorant*, I cannot conceive. If the Passage was not brought to prove the preceding words, then they are yet to be proved ; till that is done, no further notice will be taken of it.

P. 28. *And having endeavoured to make a great many ignorant and well-meaning People believe, that the (i. e. the Light within) was never taught by any but themselves.*

This is such an apparent Falshood, that I cannot admire any Man, whose Face is not cas'd with Brass, would presume to publish it to the World. Let any but read our Treatises on this Subject, and they will abundantly find Quotations taken out of the Scripture, and out of the Ancient Christians, and others, con- attesting with us the Doctrine of the *Light within*.

P. 29. *I appeal to all the World, whether this may be necessary, and indeed Essential Doctrine of Christianity (viz. of the Light within) has not been always taught and professed by the Church of England.*

If this is an Essential Doctrine of Christianity, and acknowledged as such by the Church of England, how comes it to pass, that J. S. and his Fraternity, take so little notice of it in their Sermons ? Are not some of them so far from Espousing its Cause, as publickly to stigmatize it with the Blasphemous Term of the *Light of a Natural Conscience*, an Ignorant

farum

fatuus, a Diabolical Light, a Spark from the Devil's Forge, a Whimsical Witness fetch'd from the Land of Terra Incognita, the Grand Impostor, &c. These Predicates of the *Light within*, are sufficient to give any Religious Palate a gust of the Sentiments, that some of the *Priests* of our National Church have of this Fundamental Doctrine of Christianity: Let my Opponent reconcile himself, if he can, with the rest of his Society. For if the *Light within* is a most Necessary, and an Essential Doctrine of Christianity, as we believe it is, and J. S. here seems to subscribe to it, I do not then perceive how he can excuse some *Episcopalian Ministers* from Blasphemy.

Follow the Light within: This is their whole Creed, p. 31. the Sum total of their Belief.

We are not ashamed to recommend all People to the Guidance of the *Light within*: And had my Adversary been directed by it, in penning this Treatise, he would never have published such notorious Untruths. Who is there, that hath been at any of our Meetings, or read any of our Writings, that cannot contradict this Man, and detect him of Misrepresenting us in this matter? It's true, we advise all to follow the Dictates of the *Light within*, esteeming it a necessary Article of our Faith: But that it is our *whole Creed*, or the *Sum total of our Belief*, we utterly deny.

Near the foot of this Page, he saith, *They p. 31. (Quakers) don't lay any stress in the Incarnation, Death and Sufferings of our blessed Saviour, as of any necessity to have Faith in them, in order to Salvation.*

This

This is a great Abuse ; for we (who have been Blessed with the outward Knowledge of the Holy Scripture) do believe, that it is absolutely necessary for us to have *Faith in the Incarnation, Death, Sufferings, &c.* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Falshood of this Passage is so obvious, to all those that have had any knowledge of us, or of our Principles, that I esteem it unnecessary to dwell any longer on this Subject.

P. 32. *They (i. e. the Quakers) have supposed this Light within to be God: This I will shew you out of a famous Book, * wrote by a very ancient Friend, on William Dewsbury.*

* The Discovery of the great Enmity of the Serpent, p. 13.

Should I not grant my Adversary this Supposition, the Truth of it may be doubted; until he can produce better Credentials, to confirm his Readers in these Sentiments; because I am apt to think, no unbyass'd Person will conclude, meerly from this Citation out of William Dewsbury's Book, that the Quakers have supposed the *Light within* to be God: Which is

" So deep Sorrow seized upon me, and I knew
 " not what to do, that I might get Acquaintance
 " with the God of my Life, who created
 " me for his own Praise and Glory; then
 " ceased from my vain Conversation, which
 " had lived in, and began to read the Scriptures
 " and Books, and mourn and pray to a God:
 " I knew not where he was, but expected him
 " (only) without; looking up towards the Firmament,
 " where my Carnal Imagination told
 " me he was, and as I had heard those the World
 " calls *Ministers*, whom I went to hear, whose
 " words did witness with my Carnal Imagination

tion of God : They said, he was above the Skies, calling it *Heaven*; but I felt the hand of the Lord within me. Here is a brief Relation of what happened to him, when he was Eight Years old. But from what words in this Citation he can rationally conclude, that the Quakers have supposed the Light within to be God, my Intellectuals cannot perceive.

He goes on, *Now the Devil himself had never such a Thought as this.*

What a prodigious Man is this, to whom the Thoughts of the Devil are known !

Two Lines under the former words, he asserts, That *Dewsbury the Quaker says, it's the P. 32. Carnal Imagination of the Worlds Ministers, that witness God to be in Heaven above, a meer Childish Fancy; and the Effect of a Carnal Mind, to expect God without.*

I challenge him to prove these words, or else let him be recorded as an infamous Defamer, and a notorious Forger of Falshoods. Where did *W. D.* say, *It's the Carnal Imagination of the Worlds Ministers, that witness God to be in Heaven above, a meer Childish Fancy; and the Effect of Carnal Ministry, to expect God without?* These are malicious Suggestions, no ways inferrible from the Premises. Neither is it surprising, that a Child, of the Age of Eight Years, should have odd Notions concerning God; seeing many of riper Ages, as the *Anthropomorphites* imagined that God had a Humane Shape.

Note, W. D. doth not say, *the Carnal Imagination of the Worlds Ministers*, as *J. S.* represents him; but where he uses the terms *Carnal Imagination*, he prefixes the Pronoun *my* before them;

them; whereby these words are restricted to himself.

- P. 33. *They (Quakers) have dreamt so much of Christ's being within them, that they have quite lost all sense of his having any Personal Existence or Being without them.*

From my Adversary's unusual assurance in telling Untruths, I am subject to believe, that he hath accustomed himself to Romance. Had it not been Natural, certainly he would have blushed at the Penning of such notorious Falsities.

- P. 33. *He continues his Discourse, And therefore have endeavoured to implant these wild Notions in the Minds of their Children, as soon as they can read, by charging them not to believe in Christ, as he is in Heaven above.*

I provoke him to nominate one of our Friends that ever charged their Children not to believe in Christ, as he is in Heaven above: We absolutely deny any such Doctrine. Let J. S. prove his words, or let him be stigmatized with the odious Name *Liar*, to future Generations.

- * P. 8. *His following words are, This is the Quakers Doctrine, which William Smith hath published in his Primer; * where, discoursing about True and False Ministers, he has these Expressions: "Child, " But how may I then know, which is True, and " which is False, by their words; seeing words " may be the same? Father, Why they that are " False, preach Christ without, and bid People believe in him, as he is in Heaven above: But " they that are True Ministers, they preach Christ " within.*

W. S's Sense being obscure, and liable to be wrested to a Meaning quite different from his real Sentiments, Care was taken in its Second Edition, to give his Sense in Expressions more clear, and in Terms not so ambiguous, as it was in the former. To satisfy my Reader, I shall take the trouble of reciting our Friends words, as they are printed in the Second Impression, which are as follows: "*Child*, But how

P. 55.

"may I then know which are true (Ministers)
 "and which are False, by their words, seeing
 "words may be the same? *Father*, Why they
 "that are False, preach Christ without **only**,
 "and bid People believe in him, as he is in
 "Heaven above, (in opposition to his being
 "**within**;) But they that are true Ministers,
 "they preach Christ **within**, and direct Peo-
 "ple to wait to feel him in themselves, and
 "so to believe in him as he makes himself
 "manifest in them, (whereby they truly con-
 "fess his being **without** also;) and this is
 "true Doctrine, that brings People to mind
 "that Principle of God in their own Con-
 "sciences, which comes down from Heaven,
 "and goes thither again; and such as are in
 "the Earthly Wisdom, they do not know Hea-
 "ven above. From these words it is undeni-
 "able, that we do not only own Jesus Christ,
 "as he is in Heaven above, at the right Hand of
 "God, in his Heavenly Manhood; but also, that
 "he is the Eternal Light, that savingly enlightens
 "every numerical Man coming into the World.
 "To his Spiritual Appearance in Man's Heart,
 "our Friends have been *principally* Commissioned
 "to testify: Hence our Adversaries have *Illogi-*
cally

cally concluded, that we do undervalue his outward Appearance in the Land of *Judea*, &c. Which is a gross Calumny, calculated by some designing Persons, on purpose to render us obnoxious in the Eyes of our Neighbours. We have not thought it so necessary, publicly to inculcate those Principles of our Religion which have been believed by all, as those Essentials of Christianity which have been opposed by most: Nevertheless, as occasion offers, we have not been backward to publish the Doctrines of *Christ's Birth, Sufferings, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, Glorification, &c.* thereby to manifest his Divine Power and Glory.

Lib. 3.
Cap. 3.
N. 24.

There is a common Justice due to all Authors; and if one place of their Writings may not be admitted as an Exposition of another, few of the Ancients, by an Invidious Critic, will be found Orthodox. *Calvin* hath an Expression as seemingly Heterodox as this of our Friend, viz. *Quia Christus non extra nos est, sed in nobis habitat*; "Because Christ is not without us, but dwelleth in us. Will any unprejudiced Man, only from this Passage, say *Calvin* denied that Christ had any Person or Existence or Being without us? Would he not rather give it a Charitable Construction and say, These words are Elliptical; his Meaning was, (otherwise it would thwart his Saying in other places of his Works) *That Christ is not only or wholly without us, but also dwelleth with us*? This is, doubtless, the Genuine Sense of the Author. May we take the same liberty in Interpreting our Friend's Expression, then it would run thus: *False Ministers preach Christ*

only

only without, and bid People believe in him only as he is in Heaven above; but they that are true Ministers, they preach Christ both within and without.

Here they expressly disown any other Christ, than *P. 34.*
what is within them; for this they say is the only, and principal, and greatest in being.

This my Adversary suggests, as an Inference deducible from a Quotation taken out of *William Smith's Catechism*. To manifest his Injustice, I shall repeat my Friend's words, which are:

Quest. And is that, which is within you, the *P. 37.*
only Foundation upon which you stand, and the Principle of your Religion? *Ans.* That of God within us, is so; for we know it is Christ, and being Christ, it must needs be Only and Principal; for that which is Only, admits not of another; and that which is Principal, is Greatest in being: And thus we know Christ in us, to be unto us the Only and Principal, &c. (Here he breaks off with an *Etcetera*, and leaves out the following words, which are in some degree Explanatory of the former) "Who was before all things, and in whom all things consist. Christ our Saviour may be considered in a twofold sense, viz. Either as he is God, or as he is the Seed of the Woman: As he is the Divine Logos, the Eternal Word, he is the Only, the Principal, and the Greatest in Being; in this respect only he can be said to be before all things, and in whom all things consist: For as man, these Terms cannot properly be predicated of him. These things being premised, leave it to the determination of the Moderator, whether J. S.'s Inference, viz. Here they

expresly disown any other Christ, than what is within them, naturally flows from the words of W. S. last cited.

P. 250. Near the foot of this Page, my Adversary produces a Passage out of G. Fox's Great Mystery, which is as follows: *The Devil was in thee; and thou say'st, thou art saved by Christ without thee, and so hast recorded thy self to be a Reprobate.*

Had he added the following words, he would have done the Author of this Sentence justice: which are, *And ignorant of the Mystery of Christ within thee; for without that, thou dost not know Salvation.* G. F. concludes, that the Devil was within C. Wade, from the many Lyes which were published in his Book, and from the filthy Air that came out of him, as the words immediately going before the Quotation demonstrate; and he pronounced the Sentence of *Reprobation* against him, because he was ignorant of the Mystery of Christ within, and expected to be saved **only** by Christ, as without. This is apparently the true Sense of the Author, and is demonstrable from his Expressions in the same Paragraph. He that will take the liberty to mutilate Passages, may easily ridicule the most Innocent Expressions.

P. 35. *By what I have already said, it appears, that the Ancient Friends have slighted and undervalued a Christ without.*

Being a little habituated to J. S's Modes of Speech, I am the less surprized at this confident Assertion, viz. *That the Ancient Friends have slighted and undervalued a Christ without.* The contrary, in my opinion, is evident from

what

what has been said in the preceding Sheets : But I can tell him what evidently appears, by what he hath already said, viz. That he is a Calumniator, a Parer of Sentences, a Mis-interpreter of Passages, and Publisher of known Falshoods.

His following words are, *We need not wonder P. 35: then, that the modern Quakers believe only in a Christ within.*

Whatever J. S. may falsely suggest concerning us, we do not only believe in Christ, as he is within us; but also in him, as Born of the Virgin Mary, Crucified without the Gates of Jerusalem, Ascended into Heaven, in the sight of his Disciples, and now sits at the right Hand of Majesty, to make Intercession for us.

As to the two Romantick Stories, copied out of Daniel Leed's Book called, *A Trumpet sounded*, or that related by G. K. in the *Defence of the Snake*, we do not credit the Relations; First, Because, had they given an impartial Account of Matter of Fact, it is not to be doubted, but they would have as publickly exposed their Names, as their Principles. Secondly, Because they are professed Enemies to our Society; and G. K. was expelled it for his Irregularities, &c. Thirdly, Because they are guilty of misrepresenting our Words, violating our Sense, and of publishing Falsties. This Caleb Pusey hath fixed on D. Leed's, in his Answer* to him; and I have done the like to G. K. in my Treatise intituled, *Protemis edivinus*; Till these Assertions are co-attested by Persons of more Repute than these are,

*Satan's Harbinger Incourted

*Proteus
Rediviv.
p. 20.*

I shall not esteem this Story worth my farther notice. Nevertheless, had some unwarrantable Expression dropp'd from a weak Brother, we are of an opinion, that it would have affected us no more, than the Stories, related by the *Cobler of Glocester*, concerning the Immoralities, &c. of the *Priests*; or the unscriptural Notion of that Ministers at *Turners-Hall*, who publicly said, That he believed, that *Christ hath now in Heaven the same Flesh, Blood, Bones, Stomach and Guts, that he had when here on Earth* do affect *J. Stillingfleet* and his Brethren.

As *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, so I lay on *J. S.* to prove, that *Abraham Hulings* was disowned by the *Quaker-Church* (as he term'd it) at *Burlington*, for opposing the Doctrine there specified: Till that is done, I presume no candid Reader will credit the Narrator.

p. 37.

Cannot we bless God, for *Christ's Spiritual Appearance in our Hearts*, but we must presently with the *Quakers*, banish him out of *Heaven*.

This is an Invidious Suggestion, no way relative to us: For we do not only bless God for his dear Son's Spiritual Appearance with us; but also sincerely believe, that *Christ is now in Heaven above*. That this was the Doctrine of our Ancient Friends, I can abundantly prove from a Cloud of *Testimonies*, which may be taken out of their Writings, were there any necessity of it. Tho' we have not banished *Christ* out of *Heaven*; yet I fear that *J. S.* will be excluded from that Glorious Habitation of the Saints for his premeditated Injuries, &c. which he hath done the *Quakers*, unless he repents; which I sincerely desire he may.

They (Quakers) have most certainly lost the very P. 37, 38.
Object of the Christian Faith, viz. The Man Christ
Jesus, whom they will not allow to have now a Hu-
mane Body in Heaven.

It is our Faith, that the same Man Christ Je-
 sus, that died without the Gates of Jerusalem,
 is now in Heaven, with the same Body, as much
 as a Natural and Spiritual, Terrestrial and Cele-
 stial, can be the same. To affirm, That we
 have most certainly lost the very Object of the
 Christian Faith, is a great Abuse on us: For we
 have always believed him to have a Glorified
 Body in Heaven; but cannot admit, that Hu-
 mane is a proper Epithet for Celestial Body.
 From our Consciencious scrupling the word
 Humane Body, we do not conceive, that it will,
 by any just Consequence, follow, that we do
 thereby deny the Man Christ Jesus to be the
 Object of our Faith. If we consider what
 Anatomists understand by Humane Body, we shall
 find that it is an aggregate of Material Par-
 ticles, variously modified; and from the dif-
 ferent ranging of these Corpuscles, result those
 parts we call *Flesh, Bones, &c.* These Concre-
 tions, being vitally united to the Soul, natu-
 rally constitute Man. The Material and Tan-
 gible Parts of Man, we call *Humane Body*.
 This Body is supported by Food; and, ac-
 cording to the Laws of Nature, subject to
 Hunger, Thirst, Cold, Sickness, Death and
 Corruption. Now when any of our Society
 have opposed Christ's Body now in Heaven,
 being *Humane*; they did it not, because they
 did not believe that he was now in Heaven in
 a Glorified One; but only because they could

not admit, that his Glorious Body now in Heaven, is a Material one, viz. such an one, in all respects, as 'twas on Earth, and liable to the same accidents, as they thought the term *Humane Body* did naturally imply. The concisest way to bring this Controversie to a Period, will be, to settle the determinate sense of the word *Humane Body*, by enumerating all the particular Idea's comprehended under that complex Term. Therefore I shall desire my Opponent, when he revives this Controversie, to explain what he means by *Humane Body*, and recite all the simple Idea's which he includes in that indefinite Term.

P. 38.

I asked him, (a Quaker) Whether he did believe the Body of Jesus Christ, which rose from the dead, to be now in Heaven? He replied, he was passive, and that he would not answer me.

Whether this Story is true or false, it doth not much concern me. I could advance several Arguments against the Credit of the Narrator; yet I shall omit these at present, and consider the Relation as true. 'Tis probable the Respondent knew the Nature of the Question, and how subject he was to mis-quote and pervert the words of his Opponent, therefore prudently reply'd, *I am passive*. Though our Friend (as he says) would not gratifie him with an Answer; yet if I could be perswaded that an Answer would prevent him from publishing any more Untruths concerning us, I would favour him with one. Then, hoping that it may have this Effect, my Reply is, We do believe the same Body of Jesus Christ, which died without the Gates of Jerusalem, and rose from

from the Dead, is now in Heaven, as much as a Natural Body and a Spiritual Body can be the same. But what Qualities remain the same, when a Mortal Body is made Immortal, or when a Corporeal Body is Spiritualized, or wherein to place the Identity between Celestial and Terrestrial Bodies, I confess my Ignorance.

The Quakers having, as you see, thus doted on P. 39. their Light within; you must know, that they do not believe there is any necessity to have Faith in Jesus Christ, who died at Jerusalem.

Passing by his Scoff at our doting on the Light within: To the following words I reply; The People called Quakers do believe, there is a necessity for them to have Faith in Jesus Christ, who died at Jerusalem; and they that say the contrary, do them great Injustice.

Now let any sincere and well-disposed Quaker but P. 41. attentively consider this, and try if they can justify their Leaders, for teaching the Light within to be sufficient to Salvation, without something else.

Let any but consider our Sentiments of the Light within, and then try if they cannot justify all such, as hold the Sufficiency of the Light within in our sense. We consider it as the Eternal Word, the Emmanuel, God with us, Christ, who said, *I am the Light*; and is God blessed for evermore. G. Keith, who hath so strenuously opposed the Sufficiency of the Light within to Salvation, without something else, confesses, That **in a true sense it is God and Christ, the Eternal and Essential Word.* In his *Christian Catechism*, he re-asserts the same; *The Light, saith he, is God and Christ, the Eternal Word,*

John 9.5
Rom. 9.5

* Antich.
and Saddu-
duces,
p. 23.

John 1. These Treatises being published since he was excluded our Society, can it then be imagined, he spake these things in favour of us? Certainly no.

In this sense, is not the *Light within* sufficient to Salvation, without any thing else? Is not God Omnipotent? Cannot the Almighty do what he pleases? Cannot he save this Man, or that Woman, who hath been providentially deprived of the Historical Knowledge of *Christ* in his outward Appearance? Tho' he can, and doubtless will, save many Consciencious *Heathens*, who have had no opportunity afforded them, of attaining *Faith in Christ*, as he was outwardly Born of a Virgin, &c. Yet we do believe there is a necessity for us to have Faith in *Jesus Christ*, who died at *Jerusalem*, in order to our Salvation; because we have been blessed with the outward Knowledge of the holy Scriptures; whereof many *Indians*, not through any wilful or malicious fault in themselves, but by the Providence of God, have been deprived.

P. 43.

They (Quakers) were never heard to preach up the necessity of Faith in a Crucified Jesus.

When an Untruth, stamped with a great assurance, will thereby receive a Currency; then this, probably, will be credited. Otherwise I am perswaded no Man, that hath frequented our Assemblies, or read our Writings, will believe this Calumniator herein. For my self, I can solemnly declare, that I have often heard the necessity of *Faith in a Crucified Jesus* preached up in our Meetings. Morally speaking, this *Rector* could never be certain of what he hath

here

here so boldly asserted. For tho' J. S. or One Hundred more, never heard this Doctrine preached up; doth it therefore follow, no person ever heard them? I am confident Ten Thousand others have heard our Teachers publicly inculcate the necessity of Faith in a Crucified Jesus.

He annexes, *This is a Stumbling-Block to the Quakers, as well as to the Jews.*

This is utterly false.

He continues his Discourse, *Therefore they don't expect to be saved by Faith in an outward Jesus.*

This is an absolute Untruth, in his sense, as is apparent from what I have already said in the preceding Pages.

To the last recited words, he subjoins, *But they believe Christ is nothing but a Principle dwelling in them:—***“What is Christ, saith he, (W. Penn)* but *Meekness, Justice, Mercy, &c. Here's the Quakers Christ, a Moral Habit, or a Principle of Vertue.*

*Address
to Prote-
stants,
p. 119.

Here *W. Penn* predicates *Meekness, Justice, Mercy, &c.* of Christ; can it therefore be reasonably concluded, that Christ is only a Moral Habit, or a Principle of Vertue? Certainly no: This is a Figurative Expression, called by the Schools *Metonymy*, and often used in holy Writ. The Apostle Paul truly affirms, that *Christ Jesus made us Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Sanctification, and Redemption.* Is this to be construed in a lax sense? Doubtless in the late Apostle's meaning then is, that Christ is the Author of these Christian Graces. And in *Psalms 27. 1.* it is said, *The Lord is my Light, and my Salvation; i. e. the Author*

1 Cor. 1.
30.

Author of my Salvation. According to the Forms of Speech, Christ may be said to be Meekness, Justice, Mercy, &c. that is, the Author of these Christian Vertues. If the Modes of Speech are to be disliked in *W.* I see no reason why the Prophet and Apostles should not be included under the same Predicament.

P. 44. *You may ask them, why they do pretend to preach if the Light within be sufficient?*

I am of an opinion, that if any should ask this Rector, Is Jesus Christ sufficient to Salvation, without any thing else? He would answer in the affirmative. Then I shall crave leave to use some of his own Expressions, omitting the term *Light within*, and use *Jesus Christ* in its place: If Jesus Christ be sufficient to Salvation, *why doth he pretend to preach*, and take so much Money annually for Expounding the Scriptures, and provide such large Banns to receive the Tithes? *Does Christ want any Instruction? Or doth he intend to inform our Savour? Does not this suppose, that Christ cannot or will not, teach his People their Duty, as well as J. S. can himself?* We dare not say, that the *Light*, considered as God, Christ, is not sufficient to Salvation; or that the Almighty cannot, or will not, teach us our Duty, as well as we can our selves. Nevertheless, we esteem Preaching necessary in the Churches of Christ for Instructing the Ignorant, for Reproving the Disorderly, and for Encouraging the Godly. A Talent is given to every one of us, and Power to improve it; if we are negligent, and lay it up, like the unprofitable Servant, in a Napkin.

Mapkin, our Condemnation will be just, and our Judge also : Tho' he could, by his Omnipotent Hand, have compelled us to improve the Talent, which he had committed to our charge. Our Creator hath put us in a Path that leads to Salvation, and given us a Guide to conduct us therein ; but if we obstinately refuse to follow him, after many reiterated Strivings, inwardly by his holy Spirit, and outwardly by his Ministers, he will desist, and not always strive with Rebellious Man.

We never are such Deists, as to affirm, that this P. 45. (Light within) is sufficient to Salvation, without something else.

Before a Person can be certain, that the belief of the Sufficiency of the *Light within* is Deism, he should first know what particular Sentiments intitle a Man to that Name. Such are generally termed *Deists*, who believes, there is *One God, Providence, Vertue and Vice, the Immortality of the Soul, and Rewards and Punishments after Death* ; and deny all the other parts of revealed Religion. Now, unless the *Light within* is a Synonymous Term with *God*, I cannot conceive, why such as believe the Sufficiency of the *Light*, can in any respect be justly called by my Adversary *Deists*. If it is merely a Supposition, that those who assert the *Light's* Sufficiency, do thereby deny the Doctrine of the holy Three that bear Record in Heaven, and that *Light* and *God* are equivalent Terms : Then J. S. must either grant the Sufficiency of the *Light*, or deny the Omnipotency of *God*. 'Tis possible this *Rector* hath other Notions of a *Deist*, than at present I have ;
and

and calls those *Deists*, that believe the Light
Sufficiency on some other account. Therefore
I would desire the favour of him, when he
Replies, to explain himself a little more clearly;
and enumerate the particular Idea's, which
he comprehends under that complex term
Deism; and to advance his particular Arguments,
why the solitary Belief of the Sufficiency of the
Light, should intitle its Defender to that Antichristian
Name.

P. 46.

First, I shall begin with their Pretences to Infallibility; for having once got it into their Heads by I know not what fatal Delusion, that the very Person of Christ is within them; nothing would satisfy them, as a Consequence from this, but that they need must be Infallible.

As Men, we never made any Pretences to Infallibility; neither have we attributed it to ourselves, but to the Spirit of God in us. As long as we act nothing, but what the Spirit of Truth dictates to us; so long we may be said to be infallibly guided: But when we add any of our own Conceptions, we are as fallible, and as liable to be mistaken, as others. Our Sentiments are that we have a Manifestation of the same Spirit which the Prophets formerly had, now given to us. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, was of this opinion, who said, * "Εν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ τῷ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐν καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν. The same holy Spirit which was in the Prophets, is also in us. Seeing we have, by the Testimony of this Man, the same Spirit in us, which the Prophets (who were infallibly guided by it, in penning the Relations, which are, through Divine Providence, yet extant, to our great Benefit and

* Tom.
prim.
p. 295.

Comfort

Comfort) had; Hence it may be concluded, that it is not impossible, nor improbable, but those, who have the same Spirit which they had, may, in following its Dictates, be as infallibly led.

The *Rector* is mistaken, in asserting, That *we have got an opinion, that the very Person (Manhood) of Christ is within us.* It is our Faith, that his *Glorified Manhood* is now in Heaven above, notwithstanding we have asserted, that he is Spiritually in us; believing it is no Contradiction, to say, *Christ is in Heaven,* and *in us,* at the same time, under different Considerations. The Premises being denied, my Adversary's Consequence, viz. *They needs must be Infallible,* needs not my further Consideration, till he can get better Props to support this Assertion.

They (Quakers) say indeed over and over, that P. 46. they are Infallible; but here they stop, for they don't endeavour to prove it: We use to say, Affirming and Proving are two things; but here the Quakers make them the same.

Had J. S. nominated the Persons included in the Pronoun *They*, and given us the Names of those Quakers, *that have said over and over, that they are Infallible;* this Assertion might have merited some Belief. Till better Proofs, than his *Ipse dixit*, are produced, I am induced to believe, that no Judicious Reader will condemn us on his single Affirmation, though bolstered in with the greatest assurance imaginable. His subsequent words, *They don't endeavour to prove it,* we grant, are true, had we ever esteemed our selves *Infallible.* Can it be reasonably

reasonably supposed, that we would never have made any Essay to prove it? But seeing, by my Adversary's Confession, we have not endeavoured to do it; may it not hence be reasonably concluded, that it was never one of our Tenets, but a Bear-Skin thrown on by our Enemies, to render us obnoxious in the Eyes of our Neighbours, as in truth it was? I can readily subscribe to his Saying *That Affirming and Proving are two things*: For if it was all true, that this *Rector* affirms concerning the *Quakers*, we should be some of the worst People in the World. But seeing he grants that a bare Affirmation is no Proof, I shall therefore desire his Reader to consider our Defences, before he passes Sentence on us, because he that gives a Verdict *ex parte*, is generally put to the trouble of a re-hearing, whereby the former Decree is often reversed.

P. 47. *Another mighty Priviledge the Quakers lay claim to, by having the Light within, is a Sinless Perfection; for they have always been desirous to make ignorant People believe, that they could live without Sin.*

We are very sensible of the great advantage we daily receive, by having the Light, the Spirit of Truth, given us for our Conductor through this Sea of Troubles, towards the Heavenly Canaan: But that we are thereby intituled to a *Sinless Perfection*, is not ours, but our Adversary's opinion. They that will be at the pains to read our Writings, may find, that we predicate the Light *universally*, of all Mankind; and to prove this, we often urge

John 1. 9.

John 1. 9. where the Evangelist saith, *The true light lightneth every Man that cometh into the World.* Hence it is apparent, that we do grant the Unrighteous have this Light, as well as the Righteous. How can it then be reasonably supposed, that we lay claim to a *Sinless Perfection*, only by having it? Were this Supposition true, would it not naturally follow, that the Wicked, meerly by having it, have as good a Title to a *Sinless Perfection*, as the goodly? This is an Absurdity, which we never will give, nor shall now begin to Patronize.

As to the latter part of this Sentence, *They* have always been desirous to make ignorant People believe, that they could live without Sin. The term *They* is here to be taken Universally or particularly; if *They* is to be considered Universally, it includes the *Quakers* Collectively, &c. Every Numerical Person of their Society; in this sense, we absolutely deny, that the *Quakers* have always been desirous to make ignorant People believe, that they could live without Sin. But if by *They*, the Author intends only some particulars, he had done well had he used a term not so General; and instead thereof, have published the Names of those Persons, who have been always desirous to make ignorant People believe, that they could live without Sin. A deliberate Consideration of the Probability of this Passage, will, I doubt not, in a great measure Invalidate its Credit. For what Mortal, modestly speaking, can be supposed certainly to know what another is desirous to do, for the space of an Hour? If one that pretends to tell the various desires that may occasionally appear

appear in the view of another's Mind in a few Minutes time, cannot be credited; how much less notice doth he deserve, who presumptuously takes upon him to tell, what Ten Thousand are **always** desirous to do?

Notwithstanding our Friends have not concluded, they could live without Sin, merely because the Light of Christ tabernacled in them; yet they do believe, that there is a State attainable in this life, in which it may be as natural for a Child of God to act Righteously as for a Child of the Devil to do Wickedly. And if it is admitted, as certainly it must, that Christ is more able to preserve his Followers from Sin, than Satan is to tempt them to it, I see no Reason that can be assigned, why a perfect Freedom from Sin may not be attainable on this side the Grave. The *Apocalypse* expressly Favours this Doctrine, where he said, *He that is born of God, sinneth not; neither can he, because the Seed of God remaineth in him.* To elucidate this matter, I could quote several other Texts of Scripture and produce many Sentences of the Primitive Christians, whereby the Objections against *Sinless Perfection* might be obviated; but, intending Brevity, I designedly pass them by, recommending the Eighth Proposition of *Robert Barclay's Apology* to the Consideration of those who desire a farther Satisfaction, where he *ex professo*, treats on this Subject.

1 John 3.
9.

p. 48.

Have the Quakers such a mighty Conceit of themselves, as to think no Sins of any kind can be laid to their Charge?

The

The *Quakers* were never so conceited, as to imagine, that they, considered as a Body of People, lived so regularly, that no Sins of any kind could be laid to their charge : Their Meetings of Discipline are a demonstration of the contrary : For if they did believe, that all their Members were arrived at a *Sinless Perfection*, there would be no need of Constituting or Continuing *Meetings*, for inspecting the Irregular Actions of those that walk disorderly amongst them. The Dregs of our Communion, who are gone with *G. Keith*, and are in Church-Fellowship with my Adversary, are very sensible of the Truth of what I now say; most of them having, for their Irregularities, undergone the Censure of those Assemblies.

Though they (Quakers) publish their Faults to P. 50 the World, yet they are so strangely conceited of their own Holiness, that they never make publick Confession of their Sins before God, nor ever ask Pardon for Christ Jesus his sake.

It is scarcely credible, that any Man in his Senses can be so strangely conceited of his own Holiness, at the same time that he openly confesseth his Faults, and exposeth them in print to the World; I never met with such a Person; if *J. S.* will be pleased to nominate one, it shall be esteemed by me as a Favour. Doth it not border on a Contradiction to say, *The Quakers publish their Faults to the World*; and in the same Period to assert, *They never make publick Confession of their Sins before God*? What the Faults here intended are, the Fragments taken out of *G. Fox's* and *G. Whitehead's* Writings, will declare, that our Friends do there speak

against *Pride, Slandering, Tale-carrying, Railing, Cheating, &c.* I doubt not, but the *Rector* will grant, the Particulars there recited are *sins*; then *Faults* in this place is to be reputed an equivalent term with *Sins*: If so, his words may be read thus, *They publish their Sins to the World, yet they never make publick Confession of their Sins before God.* If the acknowledging of a Man's Sins in print, is not a publick Confession of them before God and Man; let any tell me how it can be done more publicly.

P. 50. My Opponent continues his Discourse with these words, *Nor ever ask Pardon for Christ Jesus his sake.*

This is a great Mistake; for our Friends do ask Pardon of their Sins in the Name of Jesus Christ, and expect to be saved only by his Merits, and Work of Regeneration. It being common with my Adversary to take on him the Proof of Negatives, I am the less surprized in finding him at that Work here: According to my Sentiments, the Conceitedness of this Man is abundantly apparent from his positive asserting of those things, which, morally speaking, are impossible for any Mortal to be certain of: For who, but God, can be positive of the Truth of these Propositions? *They (i. e. the Quakers in general) never make publick Confession of their Sins before God, nor ever ask Pardon for Christ Jesus his sake.*

P. 51. Behold the damnable *Pride and Uncharitableness of these Quakers!* What Spirit hath seized this Whitehead, that he durst pass such an *Unchristian Censure, not only on the Church of England,*

land, but on all the Christian World, to affirm, that we are always Confessing, yet never Forsaking our Sins.

Let any Man of Sense or Temper, but seriously consider the Passage, from whence F. S. concludes, that the Quakers are guilty of *damnable Pride and Uncharitableness*, and that G. Whitehead hath passed an *unchristian Censure*, not only in the Church of England, but on all the Christian World; and I am satisfied he will not say, that such Conclusions are naturally deducible from the Premises. To have a true Idea of the State of the Case, it will not be improper to repeat our Friend's Words; which are, "Alas, poor Sinners! is not a sign of Laughter at them, but rather of Lamentation and Pity over their miserable State, who are always Confessing, but not Forsaking their Sins. May we not take up a Lamentation over the miserable Condition of those, that daily in their Prayers to God, confess, they are *miserable Sinners*, there is no Health in them, as long as they live, without an Imputation of *damnable Pride or Uncharitableness*? May we not, without passing an *Unchristian Censure* on the Church of England, believe its Members speak Truth, when they say, *They are miserable Sinners*, there is no Health in them? Is it any Breach of Charity to believe, that People are under those very Circumstances, that they repeatedly say they are? Nay, should I not be severely censured, did I dis-believe what others seriously utter concerning themselves, in their Duties to God?

Truth &
Innocency, p. 15.

My Opponent egregiously abuses *G. Whitehead's* Sense, and violates the natural import of his Words, by suggesting he affirms, *That the Church of England are always Confessing, yet never Forsaking their Sins*; we have better Thoughts of some of them: His words are only levelled against those, *who are always Confessing, but never Forsaking them*. Can any justly conclude, from our Friend's lamenting the miserable State of those, who Confess, but do not Forsake their Sins; therefore none who Confess, do Forsake them? This is such a strain on the natural Sense of the Passage, that certainly no unprejudiced Person, without doing violence to his own Judgment, could give it so malicious a Turn. The wholesome Advice we daily receive from our Leaders, makes us very sensible, that it is not our Duty only to Confess, but also to Forsake our Sins. The running in a Circle of Sinning and Confessing, Confessing and Sinning, is a State our Friend here disliked, and we also abominate.

To the preceding Words, he annexes these,
P. 51. Why the very Confessing of our Sins, is one good step towards having them Pardoned.

We are of the same Sentiments; believing a Penitent Confession, is a good step; but Forsaking our Sins, a far better one towards having them Pardoned. And that this *Rector* may forsake his, and repent of the great Injustice he hath done us, is my sincere desire.

P. 53. I shall now prove what I told you, that the Quakers do never make publick Confession of their Sins to God, nor ever ask Pardon for the Remission of them.

To prove a Negative, is a Difficulty few Men of Sense, except my Opponent, would undertake; in whose Writings, such Attempts frequently occur; some notice whereof I have transiently taken in the preceding Pages. Notwithstanding he doth here, with an assurance peculiar to himself, say, *I shall now prove, that the Quakers do never make publick Confession of their Sins to God, nor ever ask Pardon for the Remission of them*; I doubt not, but evidently to demonstrate the contrary: And seeing he hath voluntarily taken this Task on himself, I shall expect some future Essays, built on a more probable Basis, than the present are: For as yet, I am well satisfied, his Performances are far short of his Pretences. And to incline my Reader to concur with me therein, I shall offer these Severals to his Judicious Consideration.

First; It is to be observed, that this is a reiterated Calumny cast on us by many of our Enemies. Some Years since, *F. Bugg* asserted, That we did not *make Confession of Sin to God in Prayer, nor beg Pardon for the same*: To which *G. Whitehead* Replied, *Here are two notorious Falshoods*. What more positive denial of the Charge can there be? Either let these Malig-nants desist Printing such notorious Untruths, or let them prove the Respondent guilty of one; which I am morally certain they never can do. He goes on, and subjoyns the Reasons why it is expedient for many of our Friends to make Confession of their Sins, and beg Pardon for the same; *Knowing*, says he, *that many who frequent our Meetings, have great need of both*

*Sober
Expost.
p. 42.*

sincere Confession, Repentance, and Pardon of Sin for Christ's sake, and their own poor Souls.

Secondly; His only Witnesses being Deserters and extreemly prejudiced, we are inclined to hope, their Reports with the Disengaged will not be credited; especially when they are informed what a notorious Forger, Publisher of Falshoods, Calumniator, &c. *F. Bugg* hath been and that he is such an one, *G. Whitehead*, &c. in their Answers, have fully demonstrated. And that *D. Leeds*, his other Evidence, is under the like Circumstances, *Caleb Pusey*, in his *Satan's Harbinger* encountred, hath sufficiently proved. Till these Men can rescue their Writings, from the just Censures fixed on them by our Friends, I shall not think their Assertions deserve my farther notice.

Thirdly; To prove, that the *Quakers* do **never** make publick Confession of their Sins to God, **never** ask Pardon for them; is an Undertaking superiour to the most refined Powers that are Natural to Man; and without the Assumption of a Divine Attribute, is impossible to be done. For who, without a pretence to Omniscience can tell what Thousands of People, for Forty or Fifty Years last past, dispersed through the several distant Regions of this Terraqueous Globe, have done, or not done? If this *Reformer's* Ears are not large enough distinctly to receive the Sounds, formed by the Organs of Speech in every Individual *Quaker* in this Nation, as I am apt to think (if he hath any Modesty left) he will acknowledge they are not; then, I say, 'tis impossible for him actually to prove, that those *Quakers* do **never** make publick

publick

publick Confession of their Sins to God, nor ever ask Pardon for them, who live in far remoter Regions.

Fourthly; It is no difficulty to enumerate several of our Friends by Name, who have publicly prayed for Remission of Sins. But from a Supposition, that the Evidence of one of his own Party may be of greater Authority with him, than any Testimony we can give in; I shall here omit ours, and recite what G. Keith hath said on this Head in his *Fourth Narrative*; his words are, *Some of them (Quakers) have got a way to pray in the Third Person plural in their Meetings, as I have observed; as thus, If any here have sinned against thee, give them Repentance and Forgiveness; or thus, Pardon them that have sinned against thee: Thus I have heard John Feild pray.* Here is an asking of Pardon for the Remission of Sins acknowledged, by one who will say as little as may be, that may turn to our Advantage. I have heard one of our Friends make publick Confession of Sins in the first Person plural. P. 29.

Fifthly; Our Friends have thought it their Duty to pray for the Forgiveness of their Sins, as often as they have sinned. But to plume themselves with a Conceit, that they are better Christians than others, meerly because they do, with a Pharisaical Pride, often make publick Confession of them, without any Thoughts of Forsaking them, was never their method. I have discoursed several of our *Publick Friends* on this Subject; but never met with one that opposed the publick Confession of their Sins, nor the asking Pardon for the Forgiveness of

them; but were unanimous, that both was their Duty: Tho' it may be they do not encourage the doing of it with so great Formality, as my Opponent usually doth read the Liturgy.

P. 57.

These Quakers, who can cry out of Falshoods, notorious Falshoods, when they are told, that they never Confess their Sins to God in Prayer, nor beg Pardon for the same, in their Meetings; and yet you see, they have not one word to offer, nor one Syllable to say, in their own Vindication.

From our crying out *Falshoods, notorious Falshoods*, against those who erroneously assert, that *we never Confess our Sins to God in Prayer, nor beg Pardon for the same in our Meetings*; it may be probably concluded the contrary is true: And that 'tis so, I conceive, is undeniably proved in the foregoing Periods. How many words we have to offer, and how many Syllables we have to say in our own Vindication, after deliberate perusal of the preceding Lines, leave to the serious Consideration of the Sober-minded and Well-disposed Readers to determine.

I would not have any Person ignorantly conclude, merely because I have not been more large on this Subject, that therefore I have more to say: But if any should be so weak as to make such an Inference, let them know that it is not for want of Matter that I have not more copiously considered my Opponent's Objections, on this and the preceding Subjects but because I have, shunning Obscurity, as much as may be studied Conciseness.

Before the *Reſtor*'s Eighth Section, the following words are fixed as its Contents, *The Quakers* P. 57.
my Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God.

This Calumny is very unjuſtly thrown upon us. Was this as certainly true, as 'tis confidently aſſerted, we ſhould not plead for that honourable Name *Chriſtian*, which we believe ſo much belongs to us, as to any Society of people in the Univerſe. The Paſſage, from whence the *Reſtor* ſtruggles hard to deduce this Illogical Conclusion, is taken out of *W. Penn's Serious Apology*, and is thus cited, *That* P. 146.
the Outward Perſon, which ſuffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny. Before I determine any thing poſitively concerning this ſhred of a Period, give me leave to ſettle the Signification of the Terms, and alſo compare it with the Context.

Outward is the firſt Term to be conſidered; and this in Scripture ſignifies any thing that is conſpicious, apparent, or obvious to the Natural Senſes; as, *The Lord ſeeth* 1 Sam. 16. 7.
not as Man ſeeth; for Man looketh on the outward Appearance, but the Lord looketh on the Heart. It might have been tranſlated, *Man looketh on the outward Perſon, outward Man, or on the external Parts of Man; but the Lord looketh on the Heart:* That is, on the Soul, and her Faculties; which the holy Pen-men have placed in the Heart. The Apoſtle *Paul* likewise takes the word in this ſenſe; as, *Though our outward Man (or Perſon) periſh; yet the inward Man is* 2 Cor. 4. 16.
renewed, day by day.

Perſon is taken for the Viſible, External and Material Parts of Man; as, *Joſeph was a goodly* Gen. 39. 6.
Perſon:

Num. 19.
18.

Person. Again, *Sprinkle it upon the Tent, and upon all the Vessels, and upon the Persons that were there.*

Suffered is here attributed to *Outward Person*, and is to be considered in the same sense as 'tis in that commonly called, the *Apostles Creed*, where it's said, *Suffered under Pontius Pilate.* If it should be queried, *What suffered under him?* It may be answered, *Christ's outward Person, outward Man, or Body, suffered Death under him.* This word *Suffered*, does so evidently restrict *Outward Person* to the *Body* of our Saviour, that was crucified and died, that I think no *Body*, that hath not a greater Inclination to misrepresent our Sayings, than to give them their natural Sense, will say the contrary; and that which rivets me in this Opinion, is the Subject of the Dispute between *W. P.* and his Adversary, which was concerning the *Person* that died at *Jerusalem.*

Rom. 13.
1.
Ezek. 18.
20.
Rom. 6.
12. and
12. 1.

Properly, a Sound may be said to signify this or that Animal, when the Matter and Form are included in the Term; as for Instance The word *Man* properly signifies a Rational Creature, that hath a Soul and Body vitally united together. But when the Soul is taken for the whole Man; as, *Let every Soul be subject, &c. The Soul that sinneth, it shall die:* Or **Body** for the intire Man; as, *Let not Sin reign in your Mortal Body. Present your Bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.* These modes of Speech, when part is put for the whole, tho' common, are not proper, but improper or figurative ones, viz. *By a Synecdoche partis.*

Son of God is variously sensed in holy
Scripture; but strictly and properly speaking,
there is no one the *Son of God*, but Jesus
Christ, who is the only Begotten of the Fa-
ther.

From these Reflections on the Terms in the
passage under debate, and from the words that
preceded those carpied at in the same Para-
graph, I doubt not to demonstrate, but our
Friend's saying, *That the Outward Person, which
suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly
deny*, is a great Truth, and no damnable Heresie,
nor a denying the Lord that bought us, as J. S.
maliciously asserts.

To perform this Undertaking, it will be
necessary to subject to the Reader's view, the
Citation more at large, whereby the true
State of the Case may the better be understood;
and the Subject, which occasioned our Friend
to drop this Sentence, may the more readily
be perceived. *Thomas Jenner*, a Presbyterian
Minister in Ireland, printed a Treatise; in it he
spent a whole Chapter, in order to prove, that
*we denied that Person (to be the Son of God)
that died at Jerusalem, to be our Redeemer.* To
these unjust Suggestions, *W. Penn* Replies, *Which
most horrid Imputation has been answered more, I
believe, than a Thousand times; that is, That he
that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body
to be Crucified by the Jews, without the Gates of
Jerusalem, is Christ the only Son of the most
high God.* After having thus acknowledged
Him that suffered, to be Christ, the Son of God,
he goes on, *But that the outward Person, which
suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly
deny.*

deny. The Pronoun *he* is to be considered here Collectively, as including the intire *Christ* viz. as he is the *Son of David*, and the Eternal *Son of God*, miraculously united together. **Outward Person** is to be taken Disjunctively, for that part of our Saviour only, which suffered Death, and was Crucified by the *Jews*; as his own Explication to divers * Adversaries will demonstrate.

* Hicks,
Faldo,
&c.

Here is an ample Confession to him, that suffered his Body, or outward Man, to be Crucified, &c. in Terms as plain as Words can well express it, and in the same Paragraph where the Sentence is, against which the *Reckless* so fiercely objects. Who can deliver his Faith in words freer from Objections, than *W. P.* hath done, in saying, We believe that *he* that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body to be Crucified by the *Jews*, without the Gates of Jerusalem, is **Christ, the only Son of the most high God?** This Confession will abundantly satisfy the Dis-interested, that he could not intend, by denying the *Outward Person*, or *Body*, which could only suffer Death, to be properly the *Son of God*; thereby to suggest, that it was in no sense the *Son of God*, or that *Christ* was not the *Son of God*, as *J. S.* infers from it: Unless it can be supposed, that *W. P.* is a Man of so little sense, as to use Contradictory Propositions even in the same Period. For if a Denial of the *Outward Person*, or *Body*, which suffered Death, being properly the *Son of God*, virtually includes in it, a Denial of *Christ's* being the *Son of God*; then it will follow, that *W. P.* in the same Paragraph, used Terms equivalent

equivalent to these, *Christ is the Son of God*, *Christ is not the Son of God*; which is an Absurdity, I believe, no Person, that hath any personal Knowledge of *W. P.* will fix on him. Neither doth the natural import of this Passage, *We utterly deny, that the Outward Person, which suffered, was properly the Son of God*, imply, in any respect, a Denial of *Christ, God-Man*, being the *Son of God*; but only, that the outward Person, or Body, in an abstracted sense, is not properly the *Son of God*. If any shall oppose this, and say, That *Christ's outward Person, outward Man or Body, which suffered Death, was properly, viz. by Nature, the Son of God*; then the Divine Nature could suffer, die, &c. Which is Absurd and Blasphemous, and direct *Muggletonism*.

Let us look but three Pages further in the same Treatise, and we shall there see what an ample Confession is made unto *Jesus Christ*: "We do believe, saith *W. P.* in *One, only, holy God Almighty*, who is an Eternal Spirit, the Creator of all things; and in *One Lord Jesus Christ*, his only Son, and express Image of his Substance; who took upon him Flesh, and was in the World; and in Life, Doctrine, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, Ascension and Mediation, perfectly did and does continue to do the Will of God; to whose holy Life, Power, Mediation and Blood, we only ascribe our Sanctification, Justification, Redemption, and perfect Salvation.

It is obvious to all, that our Friend grants, in the same Period, that he that suffered his **Body** to be Crucified by the Jews, is the *Son of God*; yet

*Serious
Apology,
p. 149.*

yet in the subsequent Lines, denies the outward Person, outward Man or Body, which suffered Death, to be *properly* the Son of God. May it not be hence queried, How can we reconcile this *W. P.* with himself? To such, my Answer is, The *Son of God* is to be considered in a twofold sense, viz. as he is the *Eternal Word*, and as he is the *Seed of Abraham*: As he is the Divine *Logos*, he is **properly**, that is, by Nature the *Son of God*; but the *Flesh* which he took of the *Virgin Mary*, is **improperly** called the *Son of God*. To induce my Reader to concur with me in this opinion, I shall *First* tell him what denominates any being properly, or by Nature, the Son or Offspring of another, and what improperly gives him the like Title. *Secondly*, Leave some Rules of *Criticism* concerning any particular Passage that may occur, seemingly not so Orthodox, as in other places the Author is, to his serious Consideration.

Properly, a Son is the Natural Product or Offspring of any Being, whereby the Essential Properties of that Being are preserved; as, the Son of Man, Beast, or Tree.

Improperly, when that Name is given to any *per Accidens*, to signify a Person's Worthiness, or Unworthiness; Son of the Stars, Son of the Morning; so *è contra*, Son of *Belial*, Son of Perdition. By Creation, by Adoption, by Wonderful Union, a Person may also be so called.

1. Then he is *properly* the Son of God, that hath the Essential Properties of God; as, Eternity, Immortality, Infinity, Immenity, Ubiquity, &c.

But

But the outward Person, or Body of Christ, with not the Essential Properties of God ; as, Eternity, Immortality, &c.

Therefore the Outward Person, or Body of Christ, is not properly the Son of God.

2. He is properly the Son of God, that is in every respect One with the Father :

But the Outward Person, that suffered, &c. is not in every respect One with the Father :

Therefore, the outward Person is not properly the Son of God.

3. He is properly the Son of God, that is of the same Substance with the Father :

But the Outward Person, that suffered Death, is not of the same Substance with the Father :

Therefore, the Outward Person is not properly the Son of God.

4. He is properly the Son of God, by whom God made the Worlds.

Who was manifest in the Flesh.

Who dwelt in us.

Whom Believers must have, if they have Life.

Whose Voice they hear.

Whose Flesh and Blood they eat and drink.

Who is revealed within.

Who is with his to the end of the World.

Who filleth All in All.

Who was before *Abraham*, abideth for ever, and by whom God speaks to us in these latter Days.

But this cannot be predicated of the Outward Person, or Man, that suffered Death, &c.

Ergo, The Outward Person, or Man, is not properly the Son of God.

Whenever Christ speaks of his Death, he calls himself the *Son of Man*. The

The outward Person, Man, or Body, which suffered Death, &c. is improperly called the *Son of God* :

1. Because of his Wonderful Conception.
2. Because of his Miraculous Union with the Divine Word.
3. Because of his Eminent Gifts.
4. Because of his Miraculous Works.
5. By an *Hebraism*, denoting Excellency as, Mountain of God, Cedars of God, Man of God.

If my Opponent, notwithstanding the force of these Allegations, shall Magisterially say, *Whoever denies, that the outward Person which suffered, was properly the Son of God, doth thereby actually deny Jesus Christ to be the Son of God* : Let him not think, that his bare Assertion, without a full Invalidation of these Arguments, will for the future be taken notice of by me.

It is apparent in this, and in many other Pages of *W. P's* Writings, that he owns *Jesus Christ to be the Son of God*. But if *S.* shall say, This single Passage out-balance all the rest, and is to be accounted the Standard of them ; tho', according to his own Interpretation, so apparently repugnant : I shall then, with due Submission, intreat my Antagonist to lay down some certain Rules of *Criticisism*, whereby, as Touchstones, we may determine the genuine Sense of Authors, where some certain Expressions may not seem exactly to agree with others ; and directly answer, whether it is his opinion, that a Sentence obscurely worded, is to be taken in a sense intirely opposite to its Context, and to the thread of

the Discourse, running through all the Author's Writings, when he treats on the same subject; or, whether such a doubtful Passage is not rather to be interpreted by others more clearly worded. What some Ancient and Modern Christians have said on the like occasion, can tell him; but whether he will subscribe to their Sentiments, or no, is hard for me to determine: But if he dislikes these, I hope he will supply their Deficiencies, by favouring the World with some more Rational. Lest the ignorant, in the interim, should be bewildred, having no certain Compass to steer by through such a Sea of Difficulties, I shall here offer to imitate the Sentiments of others.

The Ingenious *John Lock*, in his Reply to *Edward Stillingfleet*, late Bishop of *Worcester's* second Letter: "To have ones Words, *saith he*, p. 389. exactly quoted, and their Meaning interpreted, by the plain and visible design of the Author in his whole Discourse; being a Right, which every Writer has a just Claim to, and such as a Lover of Truth will be very wary of violating. Six Lines under this, he goes on, "The Meaning of my Expression there, is to be interpreted by other places; and particularly by those, where I treat professedly of that Subject.

Offspring Blackhall, D.D. in his Sermon entitled, *St. Paul and St. James reconciled*, preached before the University of *Cambridge*, and published by their Printer, *Anno 1700*. in his 9th Page, hath this Passage: "Now this is the method, that we observe in reading of other Books, We consider the Scope and Design of

H

"the

“ the whole, and judge of the Sense of parti-
 “ cular Passages, with reference to that ; and
 “ if there be any single Passage, which we ap-
 “ prehend not the Meaning of, or which at
 “ the first reading seems to have another Mean-
 “ ing, than is agreeable to the Author’s main
 “ design ; we build nothing upon such a Passage,
 “ but wait a while, to see if the Author will
 “ not elsewhere explain himself: And if he doth
 “ not, and if at last we cannot discern how
 “ that Passage can, without somewhat straining
 “ the Words, be reconciled with others, we
 “ conclude however, and take it for granted,
 “ that the Author (if he appears to be a Person
 “ of Judgment) is consistent with himself; and
 “ consequently, that in that Passage, however
 “ the Words of it may sound, he did not mean
 “ to thwart and contradict all the rest of his
 “ Book.

* Part 2. Bishop Kidder, * in his *Demonstration of the*
 P. 295. *Messias*, is of an opinion, that “ We are to be
 “ governed, as to the Signification of a Word,
 “ by the Context and the Subject-Matter.

Facundus, Bishop of *Hermiana* in *Africa*, who
 lived in the Sixth Century, lays down this for
 a Rule, “ That we must interpret obscure and
 “ ambiguous places, by those that are clear
 “ and evident.

Isidore, a Priest of *Damiata* in *Egypt*, who
 lived about the middle of the Fifth Century,
 is of an opinion, “ That a Man must not take
 Lib. 3. “ little pieces by themselves, and put that Sense
 P. 136. “ upon them, that first comes into his Head ;
 “ but he must weigh every Word, examine
 “ the Context, the Subject of which it treats,
 “ and why it was written so.

An-

Augustin thinks, "That a dark place in *Tom. III.*
 "Scripture (and so say I of all other Books)
 "ought to be explained, by those that are
 "clearer.

Rufinus, in his First Book of *Invectives*, says,
 "That if, through Inadvertency, he hath let
 "pass, in the Translation of *Origin's Principles*, any Passage wherein he seems to say,
 "that the Son sees not the Father, and that
 "the Holy Ghost sees not the Son; he should
 "not, for all that, be accused of Error, since in
 "so many places he professes the contrary.

These Fragments abundantly prove what
 Methods the recited Authors thought most
 equitable, in determining the Sense of par-
 ticular Passages, which might not seem per-
 fectly to quadrate with the Author's Thoughts
 in other places, where the same Subject is more
 copiously handled. Would our Enemies tread
 in their steps, and permit us to square some
 obscure Sentences in our Books, by others that
 are more clearly worded, this Controversie
 would soon find a Tomb; and we should be
 as apparently Orthodox in the Essentials of
 Christianity, as our Calumniators suppose them-
 selves to be. But if our *professed Enemies* must
 be accounted the best Interpreters of our Say-
 ings, our Apologies rejected, and we denied a
 Right due to all Writers; we shall, before such
 Tribunals, despair of ever approving our selves
 so good Christians, as in the sight of God we
 are.

Nothing can be more expressly contrary to the *P. 37.*
 Scripture, than to say, *Jesus Christ that suffered,*
was not properly the Son of God.

A Lover of Truth, more than of Contention, would not alter the principal Terms under debate: Such Acts are dis-relished by fair Disputants. Doth J. S. think, that *Jesus Christ*, and *Outward Person*, are in all respects Synonymous Terms? If he doth, he is much mistaken; if he doth not, he acts like a disingenuous *Sophister* by his Opponent. It is evident, that *W. P.* takes *Christ*, and *Outward Person*, in different Senses; for in the Sentence immediately preceding those words that J. S. objects against, our Friend asserts, *That he that laid down his Life, and suffered his Body to be Crucified by the Jews, without the Gates of Jerusalem, is Christ the only Son of the most high God.* He goes on, *But that the Outward Person which suffered, is properly the Son of God, we utterly deny.* Which plainly manifests, that by *Outward Person*, he means no more than the *Body of Christ*, that suffered Death; and therefore uses *Outward Person*, and *Body*, as Equivalent Terms. Christ is here acknowledged by *W. P.* to be the *only Son of the most high God*; notwithstanding the *Outward Person* is denied to be *properly* the Son of God. To remove any seeming difficulty that may arise in any Man's Thought, concerning these Expressions; I say, *Christ* is taken here Collectively, for the entire Saviour of the World, viz. as he is both *God* and *Man*: *Outward Person* is taken Abstractly, for Christ's *Body* only; for as he was the Divine *Logos*, he was Immortal; as he was the Son of *Mary*, he was like us in all things, Sin excepted.

It is to be observed, that our Friend doth not deny, that the *Outward Person* was improperly the Son of God; but only that, properly and strictly speaking, it was not the Son of God, that is, the intire Son of God. If this *Rector* can produce any Texts of Scripture, to prove, the Outward Person, or Body that died, was properly the Son of God, he will do something worth my notice; but to quote any to prove, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is foreign from the Subject under debate; neither do I know of any Person that will oppose him therein.

The Quakers will by no means believe, that Christ took our Nature into his Person, so as to be both God and Man; for though they say, Christ is God, yet they will not own him to be truly and properly a Man. P. 58, 59.

Being accustomed to bear Injuries, we are the less surprized, when we meet with such kind of Treatment from our professed Enemies. The *Rector* is most egregiously mistaken in asserting, That we do not believe *Christ is truly and properly a Man*. This is an Abuse, which we no ways deserve: For our Faith concerning *Christ*, as we have repeatedly said, is, That he is, according to the Apostle, *Rom. 9. God over all, blessed for ever*; but after the *Flesh*, of the *Seed of Abraham*, and so truly, the *Son of Man*, *Nature* and *Person* are two obscure Terms, whereof I have no precise determinate Idea. If J. S. will be pleased to define these words intelligibly, so that I may know in what Sense he takes them, he may expect my Answer; till then, his Excuse for my Remisness therein, is desired.

P. 59. He continues his Discourse thus, *They acknowledge Jesus also to have been a Man, but not God; i. e. he was not Personally united to the Godhead.*

Unless the *Quakers* are supposed to be Men holding Contradictory Propositions, I cannot fathom his Meaning; because he first asserts, *Though they say, Christ is God; yet they will not own him to be truly and properly a Man: Yet in the following Sentence he confesses, They acknowledge Jesus also to have been a Man, but not God.* The natural Sense of these words seems to be, that the *Quakers* own Christ to be God, and no God; Man, and no Man; by saying, *Though they say, Christ is God; yet they will not own him to be truly and properly a Man; by this Passage, Christ is denied to be a Man: He goes on, They acknowledge Jesus also to have been a Man, but not God; here Jesus is denied to have been God.* Either J. S. is mistaken in wording his Matter, or we must be represented as a People maintaining such Absurdities, as no Men in their Senses can be imagined to be guilty of. The last words of this Period seem to be a Thread of the same Spinning, viz. *But not God, i. e. He was not Personally united to the Godhead.* The Pronoun relative *He*, relates to some Antecedent going before; and that Antecedent, according to the natural structure of the Passage, is God: And that which confirms me in that Opinion, is the *i. e.* going between God and *He*; which is generally esteemed a sort of a tye, whereby the precedent and subsequent words are united together: Then the Sense is thus, *They acknowledge Jesus to have been a Man, but*

but not God; i. e. He (God) was not Personally united to the Godhead. If this is his Meaning, I profess this Jargon is above my Capacity to comprehend; but if ~~he~~ relates to Jesus Christ, and my Opponent would thereby suggest, that the Quakers do not believe, that there was a Miraculous Union between the Manhood of Christ and the Eternal Word, he is extremely mistaken. For though we, with several of the Primitive Christians, have opposed the attributing Personality to God, conceiving it to be too gross a Term to be predicated of the Almighty; yet our Faith hath always been, that there was a Wonderful Union between the Manhood of Jesus Christ, and the Divine Word; and such an Union, as is altogether Incomprehensible to finite Man.

He begins the ensuing Period thus, *For we can never call (say they) the Bodily Garment Christ.* P. 59.

This Fragment was formerly quoted by Cotton Mather, and answered by G. Keith in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 25. whose Answer there, is as follows: "Because he cannot fix his false Charge upon me, of denying Christ, he essayeth (but with as ill success) to fix it upon my Brethren, as dear Isaac Pennington, whom I well knew to be a true Believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, and a Sincere Lover of him, even the Crucified Jesus, and whose Soul I believe is in rest in Christ in Heavenly Glory: And as to his words, *We can never call the Bodily Garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the Body* is easie to put a fair and charitable Construction

“ on it, as well as on Christ’s words, when he
 “ said, *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father*
 “ and yet many saw Christ’s Body of Flesh
 “ that never saw the Father. But to clear the
 “ thing, *I. P.* speaketh this in opposition to
 “ *Socinians*, and others tinged with *Socinian*
 “ *Principles*, as if the Manhood of Christ, that
 “ was born of the Virgin, excluding the Eter
 “ nal Word, was the only and whole Christ
 “ Whereas Christ was before his Body of Flesh
 “ therefore he is said to have come in the
 “ Flesh, to have taken Flesh. And if we con
 “ sider Christ, as he was before the World
 “ was, by whom all things were created, and
 “ in respect of his Godhead; the Body was
 “ not that, but the Garment of it, when he
 “ assumed it. But when we consider Christ as
 “ Man, as every other Man hath both Soul and
 “ Body belonging to his Essential Constitution
 “ as Man; so had Christ, and still hath a most
 “ glorious Soul and Body. And we deny not
 “ but according to Scripture stile, *Christ’s Man*
 “ *hood*, yea, and his Body, is called *Christ*; and
 “ when the Scripture saith, that *he was buried*
 “ *nailed to the Cross, buffeted*; and even his Bo
 “ dy was and is a part of his Manhood, and
 “ his Soul the other and more noble part
 “ most wonderfully and incomparably united
 “ with the Godhead; and most incomparably
 “ filled with all Fulness of the Godhead, and
 “ of Grace and Truth; out of whose Fulness
 “ we all receive, and Grace for Grace. And
 “ yet we do not judge, that the Godhead is
 “ circumscribed within the Body of Christ; for
 “ the Godhead is Omnipresent, as well as Omni
 “ potent and Omniscient.

This

This Passage of *I. P.* is so fully explained in the preceding Quotation, that it appears needless to dwell any longer on it; therefore I shall proceed to the Examination of the following words, which are; *They say indeed, that Christ dwelt in the Body of Jesus; yet, according to their wild Conceits, they do not allow, that he did consist of it, so as to be any part of his Nature.* Hear G. Whitehead, *I distinguish, saith he, between Consisting and Having: Christ had visible Flesh and Bones, but he did not consist of them: Here's the Heart of the Quaker-Heresie.* P. 59.

It's true, we do believe, that Christ dwelt in the Body prepared of the Father to do his Will in: But that it was or is our opinion, that the *Outward Man* was no part of the true Christ, is false. Let his Suggestion of the contrary be enumerated here amongst the rest of his Romances, till he proves it, which I am morally assured he never can do. As to the Passage pretended to be taken out of *G. Whitehead's Christian-Quaker*, viz. *I distinguish between Consisting and Having: Christ had visible Flesh and Bones, but he did not consist of them.* I have examined the Page mentioned, and the following, but can find no such Sentence, as this cited by the *Rector*. *G. W.* is there opposing a Passage in a Treatise writ by one *Henry Grigg*, who had said, *I affirm that Jesus Christ is a Man, consisting of Flesh and Bones.* By a *Man, consisting of Flesh and Bones*, our Friend understood, a Man made up only of Flesh and Bones; as his own words will declare, which are, *To consist of Flesh and Bones, implies, he could not have a Being* P. 139.

Being without them, but that he is made up meet of humane Flesh and Bones. If J. S's Sentiments concur in this matter with H. G. or with his Brother at *Turner's-Hall*, who publicly said That he did believe, that *Christ hath now in Heaven the same Flesh, Blood, Bones, Stomach and Guts, that he had when here on Earth*; he will find me a Dissenter from him therein.

Proteus Rediv.
p. 20.

To wipe off the Dirt, thrown upon us by our Enemies, in relation to our Belief in Jesus Christ, I could recite a Troop of Passages; but at present, let these following, taken out of the Book last mentioned, suffice.

Christi-an Quak.
p. 149.

"We never denied the Man Christ Jesus, nor him to be Christ, that was born of the Virgin, according to the Flesh.

P. 141.

"The one Hypostasis, or Substance, is in all the three divine Witnesses in Heaven, whose Glorious Hypostatical Union, we never denied.

P. 59.

No wonder then that Mr. Penn has denied Jesus of Nazareth to be properly the Son of God.

Where has *W. P.* denied *Jesus of Nazareth* to be properly the *Son of God*? I challenge my Antagonist to cite the Page; if he doth not produce his Author, let this be accounted as an Abuse, forged by himself.

P. 59.

A Line under the former Quotation, are these words: *Christopher Atkinson, in his Sword of the Lord drawn, has in plain terms told us long before, That to affirm Christ to be God and Man, in one Person, is a Lye.*

Having not the Book, whether this Passage is there, or no, I know not; neither am I very careful about it, because he was denied by us; and

and I did never hear, that his Books were approved of by our Friends: Therefore we do not account our selves accountable for his Words or Actions, or for what he hath published to the World in print.

C H A P. III.

The Sentiments of our Friends concerning the Lord's Supper; and Water-Baptism justified, and Womens Preaching defended.

THE Quakers have, in fact, renounced the solemn Institutions of Jesus Christ, viz. Outward or Water-Baptism, and the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. p. 61.

We are not conscious to our selves, that we have in fact renounced any of the solemn Institutions of Jesus Christ; we desire daily to be baptized with his Baptism, and to be partakers of the Lord's Supper. We cannot assent to the Sentiments of those, who say, Water-Baptism is a solemn Institution of Jesus Christ; much less Rantism, *i. e.* Sprinkling. Christ's Baptism is a Spiritual Baptism, and with Fire; John's Baptism was an Elementary Baptism, and with Water; as is undeniable from *Mat.* 3. 11. *I indeed Baptize you with Water unto Repentance; but He (Christ) that cometh after me, shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.*

Their

P. 61.

Their slighting and disregarding these sacred Ordinances, seem plainly to follow from their Antichristian Notions of the Light within.

Our Notions concerning the *Light within*, are in no respect *Antichristian*; but truly *Apostolic*, even such as the Primitive Christians maintained. Let them be but fairly stated, and we permitted to interpret our Writings, in the same sense we annexed to them when we penned them, and I doubt not but impartial Judges after a due hearing, will give Sentence in our favour. Neither do our Notions of the *Light within*, any ways incline us to slight or disregard the sacred Ordinances of Jesus Christ as my Adversary unjustly suggests; but on the contrary, it induces us to regard and value them, and to pay as much deference to them, as the Apostles usually did.

P. 63.

Switch,
p. 262.

But we are told, that it's begging the Question to say, that our Saviour in the words above quoted (viz. Mat. 28. 29.) does command his Disciples to baptize with Water.

Mat. 28.
19.

That is properly a *begging the Question*, when an Opponent takes a Proposition for granted, which the Respondent will not allow to be Self-evident, without some farther Proof. And to infer from Christ's Command to his Disciples, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; that they were thereby empowered to baptize with Water, is a *petitio principii*, or a *begging the Question*. My Reasons are, 1. Here is no mention made of *Water* in the Text, nor in the Context; therefore, that *Water* is here intended, wants a farther

De-

demonstration. 2. *Baptize* doth not necessarily imply *Water*, because there is a Baptism with Fire and the Holy Ghost, which properly is Christ's Baptism. 3. It is very improbable, that the Disciples took these words of our Saviour, as a form of words, which they were to use, as often as they baptized any with *Water*; because I do not find in my *Bible*, that any of them used to baptize *into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. Had they taken these words in the sense our Adversaries do, certainly they would never have neglected the use of them, when they administered the *Water-Baptism* to any; considering their *Actions* were to be as *Standards*, for their Followers to square theirs by.

He subjoyns, *But how can this be begging the* P. 63. *Question, when they have been answered a Thousand times, that the strict and natural signification of the Greek word Baptize, which we still retain in our Translation, is properly to wash or sprinkle with Water.*

I never, before now, imagined, that *Baptize* was a Greek, but always took it for an English word. That it is derived from the Greek word βαπτίζω, may be admitted; but that *Baptize*, so writ and spelt, as 'tis by my Author, with submission to his great Knowledge in the *Oriental Languages*, I cannot admit: But if I am mistaken therein, I shall take it as a Favour, if he will inform me wherein I am erroneous. It is possible, that some conceited *Ignoramusses* may have answered our Friends a *Thousand times*, that the strict and natural signification of the Greek word *Baptize*, is to wash or sprinkle with *Water*.

But

But unless a great Untruth, by the reiterated Assertions of a multitude, may thereby receive a Currency, and change its Nature, I am of opinion, that what was false, notwithstanding a Thousand say it's true, will nevertheless be as it was before the Thousand determined anything concerning it. To decide this matter consult the *Lexicons*, and they will tell thee, that *Βαπτίζω* strictly and naturally, signifies *mergo* or *immergo*; to plunge, or dip over Head and Ears, and metaphorically to wash; but that it signifies to *sprinkle*, either properly or improperly, I intreat J. S. to produce one Example thereof; because I never yet met with it in that sense, in any Author that was a Native of Greece. But suppose the strict and natural signification of the Greek word Baptize, is to wash or sprinkle; may I from thence naturally conclude therefore it must be taken in its strict and natural signification in the 28th of *Matthew*? Certainly no. Had the Rector demonstrated, that all the words in the 28th of *Matthew* must be taken in their strict and natural significations and then concluded, that *Βαπτίζω* in its 19th Verse, must consequently be taken in its strict and natural signification, he had argued Rationally. But to conclude, meerly from the strict and natural signification of a word, therefore it must in this or that Sentence be taken in its strict and natural signification, is a weak and trifling way of Arguing.

P. 63.

He continues his Discourse, *And have they ever made it appear, that it was either an Absurdity, or a Contradiction, for our Saviour to give Authority to his Disciples to initiate Men by this solemn*

lemn Rite into the Christian Religion? No, this is impossible to be done.

Have the *Protestants* made all the Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of *Rome*, which they have Conscienciously rejected, as the Institutions of Men, appear to be absurd, or contradictory? Or that it was either an Absurdity, or a Contradiction, for our Saviour to give Authority to his Disciples to use some of them? Certainly no. May we not, in like manner, lay aside some Ceremonies, for which we find no express Scripture-Command, unless we can demonstrate, that they do Virtually or Formally contain an Absurdity, or a Contradiction in them? Certainly we may. But this is such a rare *Medium*, to prove Christ commanded Water-Baptism, that I admire any Man of sense should urge it. We never disputed our Saviour's Power and Authority: He could have ordered his Disciples to initiate Men into the Christian Religion, without any Absurdity or Contradiction, by *Circumcision*, or by *Water-baptism*; they being both *Jewish Rites*, which were commonly used when they admitted any Proselytes into their Society. We, without any hesitation, grant, that the Apostles did Circumcise and Baptize some of their Christian Converts; but that they baptized any by Verbal Form of our Saviour's Command, and according to the Form, contained in *Mat. 28. 19.* is yet to be proved: And that which inclines me to differ in my Sentiments concerning this Ceremony from my Antagonist, is, because when the Apostles baptized their Proselytes, they did not use that Form of Words, prescribed by

by our Saviour in *Mat. 28. 29.* Can it be imagined, they would have been so remiss, had they done it by Vertue of that Command?

P. 64. *There can be no better Mediums made use of to prove any Articles of the Christian Faith, than these; by which Water-Baptism is proved to be of divine Institution.*

This is boldly said, but not so easily proved. The Validity of the *Mediums* made use of by my Adversary, to induce his Reader to believe, that Christ commanded *Water-Baptism*. I have in the foregoing Pages briefly considered; which are so far short of a Demonstration, that according to my Sentiments, they are in a great measure Precarious: Therefore, if I do not make it an Article of my Faith, that *there can be no better Mediums made use of, to prove any Articles of the Christian Faith, than these; by which Water-Baptism is proved to be of divine Institution*; I entertain my self with an opinion, that *J. S.* will not anathematize me solely on this account, till he hath answered these Objections.

P. 64. His following words are, *And whoever thinks these Reasons are not Convincing, can give no Reason for being a Christian.*

Is not here a Superlative Degree of Conceitedness? Are here all the Reasons that can be alledged? Are there not others as Convincing, as these penned by this mighty Man? Must all subscribe his Set of Arguments, or else can they give no Reasons for their Christianity? This is surely Ridiculous; for which Reason I think it needless to dwell any longer on this Subject, but shall proceed to the Consideration of the ensuing Period, which is:

Now what say the Quakers to this? Why they P. 64.
 affirm with great Confidence, that the Baptism com-
 manded, Mat. 28. 19. was not Water-Baptism, but
 only the Inward and Spiritual Baptism of the Holy
 Ghost: But how do they prove this? J. Wyeth,
 discoursing about those words of our Saviour, tells
 us, that "the Question is concerning something said
 to be required in the Commission, which the Com-
 mission doth not express; therefore, say we, (i. e.
 the Quakers) not contained in it.

Switch,
 p. 261.

We do not with greater Confidence assert,
 that the Baptism commanded Mat. 28. 19. is
 the Inward and Spiritual Baptism with the
 Holy Ghost, than J. S. doth that Water Bap-
 tism is there commanded. If we are to be
 blamed for our Dogmaticalness in adhering to
 our Interpretation of the Text, my Adversary
 is no less culpable, in Magisterially imposing
 his Sense and Additions on that Command of
 our Saviour. We do not universally conclude,
 that where something is said to be required in
 a Commission, which the Commission does not
 formally express, that it is never Vertually con-
 tained in it: But in this particular Commission,
 we do take liberty to say, that Water was not
 there intended, because not specified. The
 non-expression of Water in this Commission,
 is not the only Motive which induces me to
 make that Inference; but there are other con-
 curring Circumstances, which excite a Belief
 that Water is not there intended, 1. Because
 there is not one Syllable of *Water* mentioned
 in the Text or Context. 2. Because the same
 Evangelist *Matthew* had told us, in a preceding
 Paragraph, what Christ's Baptism was, viz. with

the Holy Ghost, and with Fire. Had Christ here Commissioned his Disciples to use a Baptism different from his own, doubtless the inspired Pen-man would have distinguished it from that formerly mentioned by him; but not having done this, we may very probably conclude, that Christ here gave his Disciples an Extraordinary Power, even to baptize with a Baptism generally peculiar to the Commissioner himself. 3. Because the Disciples did not baptize, those they initiated into their Society, *into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; as is evident from several Texts of Scripture. Peter commanded them (*i. e.* Cornelius and his Family) *to be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts 10. 48. They (*i. e.* the Disciples at Ephesus) *were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts 19. 5. They (*i. e.* the Christian Profelytes at Samaria) *were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts 8. 16. From the Apostles not Baptizing according to the Form prescribed, *Mat.* 28. 19. I conclude, they did it not by Vertue of that Commission; for had it been done by Vertue of that Commission, surely they would have used the Form there commanded.

P. 65. *To baptize with the Holy Ghost, is to give the Holy Ghost; and can poor Mortals do this? No: The Quakers have been told over and over, that this is the Gift of Christ only.*

We are very sensible, that poor Mortals, by any Power that is Natural to 'em, cannot give the *Holy Ghost*; because it is, properly and strictly speaking, Christ's Gift only: Yet pious Men, Commissionated by our Lord and Saviour, may be said to have been Instrumental to others for

for the receiving of it. Thus *Peter* may be said to have been Instrumental to others for the receiving of the Holy Ghost, because it fell on all those that heard him preach; the Text expressly saying, that *while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word*, Acts 10. 44. In like manner *Paul* may be said Instrumentally to have ministred the Holy Ghost, because it descended on those he had laid his Hands on, as it is recorded in Acts 19. 6. *And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues, and prophesied.* I would not have any imagine from these Premises, that I am of an opinion, that *Peter* or *Paul* could, at their own discretion, minister or give the Holy Ghost; but only that it pleased God sometimes to favour their Christian Endeavours, by bestowing so great a Blessing.

To conclude this point, desire them (*Quakers*) P. 55.
either to produce some plain Proofs out of the holy Scriptures, which they have never yet pretended to, that our Saviour gave Commission to his Apostles to baptize with the Holy Ghost; or else tell them, it's only a Dream and Fiction, invented to support and maintain a weak and desperate Cause.

If Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is not to be admitted as the Baptism commanded in Mat. 28. 19. meerly because the terms with the Holy Ghost are not to be found there; after the same mode of Arguing, I shall take liberty to conclude, that *Water* is not there intended, because it's not verbally expressed. For once, give me leave to predicate these very terms of *Water*, which my Adversary hath here of

the *Holy Ghost*; and then the sense will run thus: *To conclude this point, desire the Episcopallians either to produce some plain Proofs out of the holy Scriptures, which they have never yet demonstratively done, that our Saviour gave Commission to his Disciples to baptize with Water; or else tell them, such a Suggestion is only a Fiction, invented to support and maintain a weak and desperate Cause.*

J. S. had done well, had he, by plain and express Scripture, proved that Rantism, *i.e.* Sprinkling, is a Gospel Ordinance, before he had passed so severe a Censure on us, as in this Section he hath done, for laying aside Water-Baptism, which we ever esteemed to be *John's* Baptism. Now if Baptism is a Gospel Ordinance, and Rantism is not the Baptism used by the Apostles, as I could easily demonstrate it is not, will not the *Rector*, and his Adherents, be in a far worse Condition than we are? Because it is generally granted, that he that believes any Act is a Duty, and yet omits it, will be more culpable in the Eyes of his Master, than he that is fully perswaded of the contrary; according to that Saying of Christ, *Luke* 12. 47, 48. *That Servant which knew his Lord's Will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his Will, shall be beaten with many Stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of Stripes, shall be beaten with few Stripes.*

P. 67.

I have only given you a taste of the Quakers weak way of Arguing against Water-Baptism, and shall say no more of it here, but refer you to the above-mentioned Discourse, i.e. The Snake in the Grass.

In like manner, I shall take liberty to tell my Reader, that I have only given him a taste of my Opponent's weak way of Arguing for *Water-Baptism*; and shall say no more of it here, but refer him to the Twelfth Proposition of *Robert Barclay's Apology*, where this Subject is more elaborately discussed.

Having now proved, that Water, or Outward P. 68.
Baptism, is, by Vertue of a Divine Command, the Seal of the Covenant, and the solemn Rite of Admission into the Christian Church

The Rector had more truly spoken, had he said, *Having now affirmed* (instead of proved) *that Water, or Outward Baptism, is, by Vertue of a Divine Command*: For not one of his Arguments will I admit, as conclusive, till they are supported with better Mediums, for Reasons formerly assigned. Those that suggest, our Saviour enjoined his Disciples to *Baptize with Water*, must produce better Credentials than yet they have done, before they will gain our assent, let them be never so dogmatical in their Assertions: Confidence in Assertion, is not so Convincing as Soundness in Argument. Did the Apostles call *Water-Baptism, the Seal of the Covenant, or the solemn Rite of Admission into the Christian Church*? If they never annexed such Epithets to it, we certainly may be excused, so long as we tread in their steps.

His subsequent words are, *I shall in the second* P. 68.
place make it evident, that the Lord's Supper is also a Sacred Ordinance.

How successful he will be in this *second Undertaking*, the following Periods will demonstrate. In the Third Line under the last Clause,

P. 68.

1 COR. II.

24, 25.

is placed his first Reason, or more properly Assertion, which is; *For this was ordained, and expressly commanded by our dearest Lord: He goes on, Who the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my Body, which is broken for you: **this do** in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood: **this do ye**, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

We do readily Seal to the Truth of this Relation of matter of Fact, believing all things that are related concerning *Jesus Christ* in the Scriptures of Truth: But that in this Passage are contained any terms that are preceptive of any new and standing Ordinance, we do not as yet perceive. It's our opinion, that in this Text are no Imperative Words; but if there are any, doubtless we shall be unanimous, that **this do**, or **this do ye**, contain them. To have a clear Idea of the natural import of the words in this place, it will be necessary to consider them in the Greek Text. The terms there, are ἵνα ποιήτε; the Verb ποιήτε may be taken either *Indicatively* or *Imperatively*; why in the latter, rather than in the former sense? Let the Learned tell me. Till then give me leave to consider them *Indicatively*. According to this Interpretation, *This do*, and *This do ye*, must be translated, *Ye do this*; then the words of the Apostle Paul will run thus *Who the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my Body which is broken*

for you: **We do this** in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood: **We do this**, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Here is indeed an Historical Account of some Passages which were transacted, and of some Words with which our Saviour entertain'd his Disciples, as he was eating the Paschal Supper, the Night in which he was betrayed. The breaking of Bread and drinking of Wine at that time, had nothing singular in it; because it was a Custom amongst the Jews, as *Buxtorf and others inform us, for the Masters of Families, at the Celebration of the Feast of the Passover, to take Bread, and bless and break it, and give it to the rest: And also to take the Cup, and give thanks, and distribute it to those that sat at the same Table. For Christ, who was Master of this Family, to do as other Jewish Masters did at their eating the Paschal Supper, is no ways surprising: Nay, it's possible, had not the Ceremonies usual at the Celebration of the Passover been performed then, but some of the doubting Disciples might have questioned whether they had eaten the Passover, or no.

The Passage, *As often as ye eat this (Paschal) Bread, and drink this (Paschal) Wine, do it in remembrance of me*, contains no difficulty in it: The Paschal Lamb being a Type of Jesus Christ, all the Ceremonies that were transacted at the Passover, may in a sense be said to be done in remembrance of the Antitype. It's probable the Disciples at that time were ignorant, that the Passover was a Type of their Lord, who

*Synagoga
Judaea.
c. 13.

was then discoursing, and eating it with them; therefore to inform them in the Mystical Sense of that Feast, he might, from their eating it, take an occasion to expound the *Paschal Supper* to them, by saying, 'That tho' they were not 'sensible that they did any thing at that time 'in remembrance, or that had any relation to 'him; yet that Feast was a Type of him, and 'all that was therein typified must be accomplished in Him, the Antitype: The Bread 'that was then broken, was an Emblem of the 'breaking of his Body on the Cross; and the 'Wine that they then drank, was a Symbol of 'his Blood, which was to be spilt on the Cross; 'and that as they ate the Elementary Bread, 'and drank the Material Wine; so they must 'mystically eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood, 'if they would have Eternal Life; *For who so 'eateth his Flesh, and drinketh his Blood, hath 'Eternal Life.* This Construction seems naturally to flow from the words of Jesus Christ, which he used as he was eating the *Paschal Supper*. On these Considerations they might be enjoined to eat the Type, **as often** as they did eat it, in remembrance of the Antitype.

But if the Verb *would* should be taken *Imperatively*, as commonly it is in our Translations, it would import no new Command; but only that the *Paschal Supper*, as often as they did eat it, should be Celebrated in remembrance of Jesus Christ: Whereas it was commonly eaten by the *Jews*, as a Memorial of God's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites*; when he slew the First Born of the *Egyptians*. Neither doth the word **as often**, imply

imply any Command for the perpetual Continuance of this Legal Ordinance; but only, that when they did eat the *Paschal Supper*, they should at such times have in remembrance their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ had Power and Authority to constitute and ordain what outward means, he in his infinite Wisdom thought most proper to convey to our Souls the Efficacy and Benefits of his Death and Sufferings, is so certain a Truth, that I know the Quakers dare not but acknowledge it. P. 69.

We never disputed the Power and Authority of Jesus Christ; we sincerely believe, that *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to him*; and that he could constitute and ordain what outward means, he in his *infinite Wisdom*, should think most proper to convey to our Souls the Efficacy and Benefits of his Death and Sufferings. But to conclude, meerly because he had a Power to constitute and ordain what outward Means he, in his infinite Wisdom, should think the most proper Mediums to convey to our Souls the Efficacy and Benefits of his Death and Sufferings; therefore he did institute that part of the *Paschal Supper*, which was solemnized by the *breaking of Bread and drinking of Wine*, as the most proper Mediums to convey to our Souls the Efficacy and Benefits of Christ's Death, is a Consequence too precarious for me, without more probable Evidence, to admit; and till better Proof is produced, I desire my Adversary not to be dogmatical on this point.

This do in remembrance of me: Here we have P. 69. as formal a Command, as I told you, could well be contrived in Words; and if the Quakers are resolved

resolved to repeal this Law, they may, with as much Reason, renounce any Law in the Bible.

Consider the Original Words, which we translate **this do**, and interpret them *Indicatively*, as I have demonstrated, that they may without any force on the Text, be so construed; then they contain no appearance of a Command. So that the *Rector* is mistaken, in asserting, *Here we have as formal a Command,* *could well be contrived in words.*

In the following Page, my Opponent highly censures an Expression of *W. Penn's*, in his Book called, *Reason against Railing*, p. 109. which is
 P. 70. *And we can testifie from the same Spirit, by which Paul renounced Circumcision, that they (i.e. Water Baptism and the Supper) are to be rejected, and not now required.*

We are of the same opinion that our Friend is, *viz.* that those who have been baptized with *Christ's* Baptism, which is with *Fire* and the *Holy Spirit*, have no need of *John's* Baptism, which was with *outward Water*; and that those who have *spiritually* supped with *Christ*, have no need to eat the *Paschal Supper*, to put them in remembrance of their Saviour. This is a Truth, I am really perswaded few Experimental Christians will deny; and these Ceremonies being *Jewish*, are no more obligatory on us now, than Circumcision is; therefore to be rejected, or laid aside, as not now required.

His following words are, *Now can any Man of sense think W. Penn was in earnest, when he wrote after this wild and extravagant manner?*
 P. 70.

We do believe, that *W. P.* is no Hypocrite, but that his Writings concur with his Thoughts, and

and that he was (whatever the Rector's Man of Sense may imagine) in earnest when he said, *We can testify, from the same Spirit by which Paul renounced Circumcision, that they are to be rejected or refused, as not now required.*

He annexes to the preceding words, *For does P. 70. he think his Ipse dixit is enough to countermand our Saviour's Authority, and reverse the Laws of his Religion?*

In the absence of my Friend, I shall take liberty to return the following Answer to his Query, which is; That I am well satisfied, he never imagined his *Ipse dixit* was enough to countermand our Saviour's Authority, or to reverse the minutest Law of his Religion. His Actions in this matter may be allowed to be undeniable Evidences; having paid so great a deference to our Saviour's Commands, as to sacrifice his All, in obedience thereto; embracing even Sufferings with the sincere Worshipers of Jesus, rather than enjoying the Pleasures of this transitory World, which are but momentary, and in his opinion, have no true and solid Satisfaction in them.

St. Paul would never have commanded the Co- P. 70, 71. rinthians to communicate, when he knew they were guilty of such great Disorders and indecent Practices at the Lord's Table, that they were afflicted with diverse Diseases, and some of them **struck Dead**, for their horrible Profanation of this blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

This Period seems to be precariously suggested by my Opponent; for I have not observed that the Apostle, in either of his Epistles to the Corinthians, hath commanded them to com-

communicate, as he calls it. It's true, he tells them there, how they should behave themselves at the Lord's Table, **as often** as they approached it; but that *as often* in English, or *ὡς ὅσους* in Greek, implies a command, is what I oppose, and shall so continue to do, till J. S. demonstratively proves the contrary. Neither is it evident from the Apostle's words, that any of the *Corinthians* were afflicted with *divers Diseases*, or *struck Dead*, meerly for their indecent and disorderly Practices at the Lord's Supper. It's readily granted, that what the Apostle says in verse 30. is true, viz. *For this cause many are weak and sickly amongst you, and many sleep*. What was the cause why many were weak and sickly amongst the *Corinthians*? Look back to vers. 21. and it will appear there undeniably, viz. by reason of their *Drunkennes* and *Intemperance*. That Intemperance and Drunkennes, should produce Weakness, Sickness, &c. is no ways surprizing; for daily Observation confirms me in the Truth thereof. Take the Advice of a *Physician*, and he will tell thee, that Drunkennes causes Crudities in the Stomach; from these Crudities in the Stomach, proceeds a Dyscracy in the Blood; from a Dyscracy in the Blood, many Diseases take their Source and Origin. Neither is it in any respect miraculous, that those who intemperately swallow intoxicating Liquors, should be affected with lythargick and sleepy Disorders; nay, it is as natural for Intemperance to cause Sleepiness, Weakness, Sickness, &c. as for the Fire to burn, or for a Stone to gravitate out of its centre.

As to the latter part of this Sentence, *And some of them were struck Dead for their horrible Prophanation of this blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord.* These words denote, as if some signal Judgments followed the disorderly Eating of the Lord's Supper, as sudden Death; whereas I have met with nothing in that Apostle's Writings that favours such an Opinion. Indeed he speaks of Natural Causes producing their Effects, *viz.* of Intemperance causing Weakness, Sickness, &c. These Effects are not to be accounted Judgments unusual or uncommon, being only the Natural Productions of Natural Causes. Who these *some* are, that were *struck Dead for their horrible Prophanation of this blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, let my Adversary demonstrate; or else this whole Passage will be enumerated by some in the Catalogue of his Romantick Stories.

Thus says J. Wyeth, "*These words of the Apo-* P. 72.
stle, 1 Cor. 11. 23, &c. are plainly a Narration
of somewhat done by our Saviour, but contain not Switch,
any Institution or Command, as the observing p. 265.
Reader may find. He must certainly come short
of an observing Reader, if a Quakers bold and con-
fident Assertion, without Proof, will pass for a Ra-
tional Argument.

To this Saying of my Friend, I can freely set my Seal; being fully perswaded, that the Words of *Paul, 1 Cor. 11. 23.* contain no Institution or Command, either Explicitly or implicitly; but are only a Narrative of somewhat done by our Saviour the Night he was betrayed. Let any Person, if he can, tell me
 where

where the Imperative terms are; the words of the Apostle in that place are, *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took Bread: Where his supposed Imperative words in this Verse are, let this insulting Rector demonstrate; or let him for the future not so superciliously say, he must certainly come short of an observing Reader, if a Quaker's bold and confident Assertion, without Proof, will pass for a Rational Argument.* We are so far from desiring, that any of our Assertions, without Proof, should pass for Rational Arguments, that we are desirous of nothing more than to have our Principles squared by the holy Scriptures; and that our Arguments may no farther be admitted, as conclusive, than they are Rational. As we were never Favourers of an *implicit Faith*, or of *blind Obedience*; so we desire none of our Followers to adhere to any Assertion, let it be never so boldly or confidently delivered, unless it carries a Rational Conviction with it. And as J. S. will not admit a bold and confident Assertion, without Proof, to pass for a Rational Argument; if I in like manner do not admit his bold and confident Assertions, without evident Proofs, to pass currently for Rational Arguments. I am of an Opinion, that so long as I tread in his steps, he will excuse me therein. If any imagine, that the *Et cetera* in the Quotation will be of any service to my Opponent, let them know, it is his Addition to our Friend's words.

He continues, *For does not the Apostle tell us, P. 72. that he had it by Immediate Revelation from our Lord himself, that he took Bread, and brake it, &c?*

We grant, that the Apostle delivered to the *Corinthians*, what he had received of the Lord, by Immediate Revelation, viz. how that our Saviour, as he was eating the Paschal Supper, took Bread, and brake it, &c. What then? Doth it therefore follow, that this Act of Christ is preceptive to us, meerly because the Apostle received this relation of Fact by Immediate Revelation? Certainly this is no just Consequence. If there are any Imperative terms in this Passage, let the *Rector* spell them out; till that is evidently done, let him desist Clamouring against our Friend on this Score.

Did not he (Jesus) assume our Nature, and P. 75. live a mean and contemptible Life here on Earth; and at last underwent a cruel and ignominious Death for our sakes; and ought this ever to be forgotten by Christians?

We make it an Article of our Faith, that Jesus Christ assumed our *Nature*, as it's pure, tho' not as it is tainted with Sin: We do believe, that he lived a mean and contemptible Life here on Earth; that at last he underwent a cruel and ignominious Death for our sakes; and that this ought never to be forgotten by us, or any other Christians. But that the Paschal Supper is the only and adequate Medium, to put us in remembrance of the Death and sufferings of our Saviour, is, as we conceive, to be more Substantially proved, than yet is done,

done, by those that favour such Sentiments before we shall subscribe their Assertions.

P. 75. *Now the Merits of Christ's Death are more effectually applied to us, by a worthy receiving of the Sacrament.*

Our Faith is, that the Merits of Christ's Death are more effectually applied to us, by supping with him spiritually, and by a living Faith in him, than by eating a little Elementary Bread or by drinking a Glass of Material Wine; notwithstanding it may (as the Priests Phrase is) be consecrated.

P. 77. *They (Quakers) have branded them (Water Baptism and the Supper) with vile and reproachful Names, and have set up in their stead some novel Inventions of their own.*

We are not sensible, that we have branded the Baptism of Christ, or his Supper, with vile and reproachful Names; or have given John's Baptism any Predicates, which, according to the intent and meaning of our words, may not be justified; or have too severely censured the eating of Bread and drinking of Wine, which some profane Priests and People have done in imitation of our Saviour's eating and drinking with his Disciples, the Night he was betrayed, and call it the Lord's Supper; though in reality 'tis no more his, than that was, where the Eater and Drinker, eat and drank, as the Apostle affirms, *Damnation to himself*; or that we have set up in their stead any novel Inventions of our own, we cannot admit: The contrary, I doubt not to demonstrate in the following Pages.

1 Cor. II.
29.

They have spoken Contemptuously of these venerable Mysteries of the Christian Religion : I have a Paper by me, wrote by G. Fox, wherein he says, that the World's Baptism is with sprinkling a little Water ; and the Cup the World takes, is a little Bread and Wine ; and that they call a Sacrament, which there is no Scripture for. P. 77.

Whether the Paper, from whence this Quotation was borrowed, was writ by G. F. or no, is not very material ; because the words, taken out of the pretended Manuscript, are in themselves true. For what is the *World's*, i.e. wicked Men's Baptism, but sprinkling a little Water on the Face of him, that is to be Baptized ? What is their Sacrament, but a little Bread and Wine ? What Scripture have they to justify the use of the term *Sacrament* ? Surely none : That there is any Contempt in calling Water, Water ; Bread, Bread ; Wine, Wine ; unless, with the Papist, the Rector believes, that after the Ceremonies are performed, their Species are transubstantiated ; I cannot conceive.

The words following the last Citation are, could shew you also a long rambling Epistle, sent P. 77: a Quaker to some of the Ancient Friends, — who tells them, that having had troubles on him some time before, “ he thought if he did but receive the Bread and Wine, which the Priests call a Sacrament, he should be well ; but when I had taken the Bread, I thought the Devil had entered into me, and that I had sinned against the Holy Ghost.

'Tis possible my Opponent may have an Epistle, wherein this Passage is ; but for what Reason he cites it here, I cannot tell, unless it is

to perform his Pretensions in the Title-Page, viz. *To entertain his Reader with some new Quotations, &c.* The Subject he is now upon, is to prove, *The Quakers have prophanely abused and reviled the divine Institutions of Christ*; how this is an Instance thereof, let the Reader judge. But whether the Author of this Epistle was a *Quaker*, is yet to be proved.

P. 38. Three lines under the former Passage, is a short Quotation out of *James Naylor's Discovery of the Man of Sin, &c.* Anno 1654. To give the Reader a true Notion of the genuine Sense of the Author's words in that place, I shall cite the Clause, with some words that immediately precede it in the same Period, which are;
 "Whereas you say, we cry down Baptism and
 "the Lord's Supper, it is false; for the Bap-
 "tism of *John* we own, which is with Water;
 "and the Baptism of *Christ*, with the Holy
 "Ghost and Fire, we own; and the Supper of
 "the Lord we own, and our Faith feeds upon
 "him; and the eating of his Flesh, and drink-
 "ing of his Blood, is our Life, *John* 6. 53, 54.

P. 73. And (here the Rector begins) *we deny your Faith, which, you say, is nourished by Bread and Wine, which is Carnal; and your Sprinkling of Infants we deny, which, you say, you can clear up to be an Ordinance of Christ; but do not, nor can do it.*

From these words of our Friend, it evidently appears, that he acknowledged *Christ's Baptism and Supper*, and the true Christian Faith, which is *only* nourished by the *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, spiritually eaten; and only opposed that Faith, which is nourished by Material Bread

Bread and Wine, to be the saving Faith of Jesus Christ; or that Sprinkling of Infants, as his Adversaries held, and pretended from Scripture to prove, but could not, was an Ordinance of Christ's Institution. I am persuaded, that 'tis above the great Abilities of my Opponent, to prove, *Sprinkling Infants* is an Ordinance of Jesus Christ; or that it was practised by the Primitive Saints.

The next ensuing words are, *We deny your P. 78. Carnal Sacrament, for which there is no Scripture.*

To elucidate the Author's sense, it will be necessary to repeat the foregoing part of the Sentence, which is, "The Supper of the Lord *ibid. 11.* we own, which is Spiritual; and deny **your** "Carnal Sacrament, for which there is no "Scripture. The Author here owns the Lord's Supper, but denies **your** Carnal Sacrament to be his Supper. Who is to be understood by the Pronoun **your**? Why *Five Lying and Slandering Ministers*, which he was then answering, that they were *Lyars and Slanders*. He asserts in the same Paragraph, what *Sacramentarian* dares affirm, that the Supper of *Lying and Slandering Priests*, is the Lord's Supper? The Apostle told the unregenerate *Corinthians* in the days of old, who pretended to eat the Lord's Supper, *This is not to eat the Lord's Sup-* *1 Cor. 11. 20.*
per; or, as the Marginal Reading has it, *Ye cannot eat the Lord's Supper.* Why could they not eat the Lord's Supper? The Reason is apparent from the Context, because they were un-sanctified Persons. If there is any Scripture for the term *Sacrament*, let my Adversary cite the Verse; till that is done, let him desist abusing us on that account.

P. 78. He continues his Discourse, *The next Year after, (1655.) out comes FOX his News out of the North, and you shall hear how he belched forth his Rage and Spite against these Means, which Christ appointed in order to our Salvation: "And*
 P. 14. *"their Sacrament, says he, as they call it, is "Carnal, and their Communion is Carnal; a "little Bread and Wine, which is the Table "of Devils, and Cup of Devils, which is in "the Generation of Serpents, in this great "City Sodom and Gomorrah: So Dust is the "Serpent's meat, &c.*

By the Form of this Passage, as 'tis published by J. S. one would think it is a continued Discourse, without the omission of any words in the Body of the Quotation. To undeceive his Reader, I shall take the trouble of citing the Quotation, as 'twas written by our Friend, and print the Omissions in a different Character, "**And their** Sacrament, as "they call it, is carnal; *and there is not a word "in the Scripture, that speaks of a Sacrament; "and their Communion is Carnal, a little "Bread and Wine; and so Drunkards, and "Raylers, and cursed Speakers, all meet together "in this Fellowship; which is the Table of Devils, and the Cup of Devils, which is in the "Generation of Serpents, in this great City "Sodom and Gomorrah: So Dust is the Serpent's meat, &c.* To have a true Notion of the Author's sense, it may not be inconvenient to consider the Antecedent to the Relative **their**; to find it out, we must look backward. In the same Paragraph occur these words, *Blind Guides, Dissembling Hypocrites Workers of Iniquity,*

guity, *Adversaries of Righteousness, Enemies of God, Blasphemers, &c.* Is not these Men's Sacrament Carnal? Is there any Spirituality in it? Is the term *Sacrament* once used in the Scriptures? What is the Ungodly Man's Communion, but a little Bread and Wine? Is the Species of it changed? Is the Table of Drunkards, Raylers, and cursed Speakers, the Table of the Lord? Men that so abominably misrepresent Passages, seem more desirous to expose their Opponents Persons, than their Principles. A Moral *Heathen*, or *Jew*, would scorn to treat his Adversary so dis-ingenuously, as this *Rector* hath here done by our Friend.

He goes on, *You say, that sprinkling Infants* *Ibid. 39.*
is the Baptism, which baptizeth them into the Faith, *P. 72.*
and so into the Church, which is Carnal; and you
tell People of a Sacrament, bringing them to eat a
little Bread and Wine, and say, that this is a
Communion of Saints, which is Carnal; and all this
feeds the Carnal Mind.

This Quot is cited to prove, the *Qua-*
kers have pro- *y abused and reviled the di-*
vine Institution *Christ:* How pertinently it
 proves the t for which it is brought, let
 the Judicious *ermin* Are there not ma-
 ny who have , and yet of an opinion,
 that Sprinkl *Infant:* not the Baptism,
 which baptiz *them* , the Faith, and so
 into the Chur Is not his Church Carnal,
 or Material, v here are equiva^t nt terms?
 Are there n some now-a-days, who tell
 People of a rament, and giving them a
 little Bread a Wine, say, such Eating and
 Drinking is the Communion of Saints? A

not Bread and Wine carnal or material Substances? Do not such like Performances gratify the Carnal Mind? And do not many take up their rest in these Externals? If these Sayings are true, carp not at them; if in any respect they undervalue the *divine Institutions of Christ*, solidly demonstrate it.

P. 78. A Line under the former Quotation, is a mutilated Passage, taken out of *Edward Burrough's Works*, and is by J. S. cited thus, *Their Doctrines are of the Devil, who say, Sprinkling Infants with Water, is Baptism into the Faith of Christ; this is the Doctrine of the Devil.*

P. 190. Whereas E. B's words are, "Their Doctrines are of the Devil, who *deny the Truth, which the Scripture bears witness of*; and say, "Sprinkling Infants with Water, *when they are two or three days old*, is Baptism into the Faith of Christ; this is the Doctrine of the Devil. Is a Man that so unfairly quotes his Opponent's words, likely to convince him of an Error, if in one? Certainly no; but much rather to confirm him in the Opinion he defends: Because Men of Sense generally determine, that Truth needs no Sophistical Practices to screen it from the assaults of Error. I am perswaded J. S. will not publicly calumniate the fore part of this Sentence, viz. *Their Doctrines are of the Devil, who deny the Truth, which the Scriptures bear witness of.* As to the latter part thereof, if my Opponent will defend it, let him argumentatively prove, that *Sprinkling Infants with Water, when they are two or three days old, is Baptism into the Faith of Christ*, and that they are thereby truly Regenerated: For the Apostle positively

positively says to the *Galatians*, that *as many* Gal. 3.
of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put 27.
on Christ. That Sprinkling Infants hath such mi-
 raculous Effects, was never an Article of my
 Faith: For, with my Friend, I ever accounted
 that Doctrine erroneous.

Annexed to the former Passage, are these
 words, *These have filled the World with damnable*
Heresies, as holding, that Sprinkling Infants with P. 78.
water, is Baptism into the Faith of Christ, &c. P. 195.
These are damnable Heresies, even to the denying
the Lord that bought them.

To have a clear sense of the Intent and
 Meaning of our Friend in this place, it may
 be necessary to supply the defects of his *Et*
cetera, and to cite him more largely; which
 I shall do, beginning where my Adversary
 does: "These (false Teachers) have filled
 "the World with damnable Heresies, as hold-
 "ing forth, that Sprinkling Infants with Wa-
 "ter, is Baptism into the *Faith of Christ*; and
 "that the Steeple-house is the Church; and
 "that singing *David's Experiences* in the
 "World, amongst wicked People, in Rhime
 "and Meetre, is singing to the Praise of God:
 "And these are damnable Heresies, even to
 "the denying the Lord that bought them;
 "for they deny the Light of the Lord Jesus
 "Christ—to be sufficient to lead to Christ,
 "and to the Kingdom of God. We are not
 ashamed to acknowledge, that our Sentiments
 are, that a tenacious holding forth, that Sprink-
 ling Infants with Water, is Baptism into the
Faith of Christ; and that the Steeple-House is

the Church of Christ; and that singing *David's* Experiences, amongst wicked People, in Rhyme and Meetre, is singing to the Praise of God; these are Heretical Opinions, which may occasion the Damnation of some of those that maintain them; and that the denial of the Sufficiency of the Light of our Lord Jesus Christ, to lead us to Christ, and to the Kingdom of God, may in a sense be said to be a denial of the Lord that bought them.

P. 78. *The Quakers, both in their Writing and Discourse, seem mostly to clamour against Infant-Baptism; yet this is only to amuse weak Understandings, for we have no dispute with them about the proper Subjects of Baptism; but whether outward or Water-Baptism be of Divine Institution.*

Some of our Arguments are often *ad hominem* and calculated accordingly; when our Adversary is one that defends *Infant-Sprinkling*, uses it instead of Baptism, and accounts *Infants* the proper Subjects thereof, we put him on proving the Practices of his Society from the Scriptures, or from the Actions of the Primitive Christians in the first Century; if he cannot clearly do this, we are of an opinion, that it is no impertinent way of Reasoning to answer them thus, Either prove your Practices of Sprinkling to be the Baptism of Christ, *Mat. 28. 19.* or else desist from Calumniating us for the future, because we have laid Water-Baptism aside. For if *Infant-Sprinkling* is not the Baptism there commanded, as certainly 'tis not; and if Baptism be of divine Institution; then he that only Rantizes, is equally guilty of the Breach of a divine Command, as they that totally lay it aside; therefore

There is no fit Person to pass Sentence on them. For where two Persons are equally culpable, neither of them is rightly qualified to pass Sentence on the other. These sort of Arguments are more often used to Silence, than to Convince an Opponent.

He goes on, *And this you see they have prophanely despised, and utterly disowned.* P. 78.

By the natural Explanations of our Friend's words, which in the foregoing Pages I have given, any dis-interest Person may clearly perceive, that J. S's Intellectuals were clouded with Prejudice, when he so notoriously mis-interpreted them. Neither can we admit it for a Truth, that we have either prophanely despised, or utterly disowned Water-Baptism: We do believe that it was once a *Command* from Heaven to *John*; therefore not to be prophanely despised. And seeing we own it to have had its time, properly speaking, I think it cannot be said, that we have utterly disowned it.

The following words are, *G. Whitehead, in P. 79.* *the very Title-Page of his True Ministry, &c.* *he wrote particularly against the Anabaptists, who deny Infant-Baptism; calls Water-Baptism it self, Idolatry; and those who baptize with Water, he says, are deluding about Shadows and Carnal Ordinances.*

It is not very common to judge of Men's Doctrines from Title-Pages; but seeing my Adversary hath led me to it, I shall not decline following him. The Author's sense, from the words cited, are somewhat obscure; in order to remove that, I shall repeat them as they stand in the Title-Page; he begins it thus, *The Authority of the true Ministry, in baptizing* with

with the Spirit; and the Idolatry of such Men, are doting about Shadows and Carnal Ordinances, and their Ignorance of the Spirit's Baptism (of which Water-Baptism was but a Figure) discovered. Doth our Friend here call Water-Baptism it self Idolatry, as this Rector affirms? Or doth he say, that those, who baptize with Water, are doting about Shadows and Carnal Ordinances? I provoke him to shew me these words, if he can. Should I take shreds of Sentences in J. S's Writings, as he doth here, and in several other places, and prefix some words of my own to them, I might justly expect to be severely canonaded with Clamour and Noise.

By the Title-Page, we may determine, that the Author, in the ensuing Treatise, intended to discover the Idolatry of such Men, as were doting about Shadows and Carnal Ordinances; but that Water-Baptism is the Idolatry there intended, wants, tho' positively asserted, to be proved; for the terms do not naturally carry any such sense; neither is it a due Consequence from them: Nay, the contrary seems to be the natural import of the words in that Period. For who can imagine, that any Man in his Senses will maintain, that Water-Baptism is a Figure of the Spirit's Baptism, and at the same time esteem it Idolatry? What greater Absurdity can a Christian be guilty of, than to say, a Baptism which is Idolatry, is a Figure of Christ's Baptism? But this is the Sense of that Passage, if my Adversary's Interpretation of it be true. Some may perhaps Query, if Water-Baptism is not the Idolatry there intended, what is the Idolatry of the Baptist, which G. W. there

here discovered? My answer is, He that is desirous to be fully satisfied therein, should read that Book. In its third Page is this Passage, *In thy Blindness, thou (Samuel Bradley) hast set Water-Baptism above the Baptism of the Spirit, and so hast made an Idol of it.* And in the fourth Page is this Sentence, *And Idolatrously hast set Water-Baptism above it; when-as the Baptism of the Spirit, was that which Water-Baptism did but shadow or figure forth.* From these Fragments it is evident, that our Friend did not call Water-Baptism *Idolatry*, but the preference which S. B. gave it to the Baptism of the Spirit. Let J. S. demonstrate, that G. W. called *Water-Baptism it self Idolatry*, as he boldly asserts, or let him be stigmatized with the Name *Forger*.

Wyeth hath endeavoured to ridicule and expose P. 79. the Lord's Supper, by such a dull piece of Buffoonry, that is not usual to be met with; for after he has repeated these words of St. Paul, "This do ye, **as oft** as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. **For as often** as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. He, with his usual Confidence, says, that these words do not import any Command or Institution; and challenges the Author of the Snake to prove, that they signifie any more, than if one should say to him, **as often** as thou goest to Westminster, call upon John Thompson: Now what a **prophane Wretch** is this, to make the most solemn Institutions of our Saviour, the Subject of his Sport and Drollery!

Endeavours, which tend to ridicule or expose the Lord's Supper, or to make the solemn

In-

Switch,
p. 265.

Institutions of our Saviour, the Subject of any Man's Sport and Drollery, we disapprove; conceiving that such Irreligious Acts relish more of an Atheistical, than of a Christian Temper; therefore we countenance none therein. How far *J. W.* is guilty of the severe Charge he stands here impeached of, his own words, impartially cited, will best demonstrate; which are, *These* (words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 11. 25, 26.) *I say, do not import any Command or Institution, which because the Snake will have that they do, let him shew wherein; if he thinks the words as often have some Imperative force, let him see if he can prove that that Imperative force is more, than one should say to him, as often as thou goes to Westminster, call upon John Thompson: I easily think the Snake will conclude the Imperative force of these words none at all; and will go, as occasion calls, to Westminster, and not think himself obliged to make that visit.* Where is the Lord's Supper ridiculed and exposed? Where is the dull piece of Buffoonry? By what words of *J. Wyeth's* are the solemn Institutions of our Saviour, made the Subject of his Sport and Drollery? Let these Fallacies be proved, or else let him desist repeating them for the future. It would better become the *Rector*, to take an intire Period, and answer it like a Man of Parts and Sincerity, than nibble at a few words in the middle of a Period, and give them a Turn, no ways consentaneous to the Context. Our Friend's Comparison doth not lie between the Lord's Supper, spoken of in the recited Text, and the *Snake's* calling on *John Thompson*, when he goes to *Westminster* but

ut between **as often** in 1 Cor. 11. 25, 26. and
as often in the Instance given by him. May
 not a Man illustrate the signification of any
 Term in the Bible, by a familiar Example,
 without incurring the severe Censure of a *pro-
 phane Wretch*, or of a *vile and senseless Railer*,
 at the Subject treated on in that Text of
 Scripture? Whether one may or no, is left to
 the sincere Christian's determination.

One might well wonder how it should ever come p. 80.
 into these Men's Heads, to fancy these Novelties
 (Womens Preaching, and Womens Meetings) to be
 of Christ's Institution; for we have an Apostolical
 Injunction against all Women Preachers whatso-
 ever. Hear St. Paul, "Let **your** Women, says 1 Cor. 34.
 be, keep Silence in the Churches, it is not 35.
 permitted unto them to speak there: It is
 a shame for the Women to speak in the
 Church. Again, Let the Women learn in 1 Tim. 2:
 Silence, with all Subjection. I suffer not a 12.
 Woman to teach, nor usurp Authority over
 the Man, but to be in Silence.

We are satisfied, both from Scripture and
 Ancient Records, that Womens Preachings are
 no Novelties in the Churches of Christ; and
 for them, who were *Deaconesses*, to have Meet-
 ings for the more advantageous supplying the
 Necessities of the Poor, &c. under their Care,
 we think is no ways improbable nor un-
 necessary; neither do we believe, that there
 is any Apostolical Injunction against all Women-
 Preachers whatsoever, as my Opponent dogma-
 tically asserts. The Texts of Scripture, cited
 by him, do not prove, there is a positive
 Command against all Womens Preachings: I shall
 consider

consider them first as quoted by him, then shew how the principal terms in these places might be otherwise translated, than they are in our Bibles.

The Premises, from whence this Conclusion is deduced, are contained in the Apostle's words to the *Corinthians*, where he says, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak*; I shall take leave to observe, that *Paul* doth not in this place say, *Let all Women*; but only, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Churches*. Some may query, Why should the Women there be prohibited from speaking in their Churches, more than those that dwelt in other places? My answer is, Because there were some Inconsiderate and Talkative Women, who by their unprofitable Questions, disturbed the Churches of the *Corinthians*. We likewise desire, that such Women may keep Silence in our Meetings, who are for proposing their Queries, as these did, to be Answered; the Apostle orders, that these should not be of the number of the Interlocutors, either by telling their own Thoughts, or asking those of others; but that they should do this at home, and even there should not authoratively take on them to *teach* their Husbands: Hence I conclude, that this Text doth not affect our Women, who are not in their Practices. If any are of different Sentiments, let them consider the Pronoun *Your* restricts this Passage to the Women of *Corinth*; so not of an universal Obligation.

The Apostles might have more cause to lay this Injunction on the Citizens of *Corinth*, than on those of other places: For these (if Ancient Histories are true) were zealous Worshippers of the Heathen Goddess *Venus*; this Woman was by them accounted the *Goddess of Love*, and worshipped with a great deal of Lewdness and Obscenity: Hence her Adorers became the most Impudent Creatures in all *Greece*. These Women having habituated themselves to all manner of Lewdness from their Infancy; is it then any wonder, if some of them, after they had embraced the *Christian Faith*, should be more forward in Speech, than others, that had been more modestly educated? If this is true, doubtless these needed such an Inhibition, more than their Neighbours. That they were such, as I have represented them, *Baronius* testifies, *Inter Græcos*, Tom. 1. p. 451. saith he, *Corinthiæ femina patria lege atque consuetudine Cultui Veneris erant addictissimæ & proinde omnium impudicissimæ, Quippe quæ pietatim putarent sua Corpora prostituere*: 'Amongst the *Grecians*, the Women of *Corinth*, by the Law and Custom of their Country, were the most addicted to the Worship of *Venus*: Hence it was, that they came to be the most Impudent of them all; for they did think it a Religious Duty to prostitute their Bodies.

Probably on these Motives it was, that *Paul*, in his *Epistle* to them, said, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Church*.

As to the following words of the Verse, viz. *For it is not permitted unto them to speak there.* The Women here prohibited to speak in the Church, were such as he was then Deciphering, who by their Queries wanted to be instructed in the Doctrines, &c. of Christianity; the Apostle orders these, that if they would learn any thing, they should ask their *and* Husbands at home, and not trouble the Churches of Christ with such sort of Interrogatories, which might more seasonably be answered in their own Houses.

Note, This Apostolical Injunction is only levelled against those Women, that were *Learners*, and not against those that were Commissionated by their Saviour to deliver a Message to his People: 'Tis not the Cause of the first, but of the latter, that I advocate.

It is probable, that many from the Apostle's words now under consideration, viz. *It is not permitted unto them to speak*; and from what he saith in the following Verse, viz. *It is a shame for Women to speak in the Church*; conclude, that **all** Women, however Commissionated, are, by vertue of these Sentences, enjoined to observe a perpetual Silence in the Church; and that the term *speak*, is to be taken [here] in a restricted sense; and this seems to be my Opponent's opinion: If 'tis, I then say, The Church of *England*, whereof he is a Minister, are as guilty of the Breach of this Gospel-Precept, if 'tis one, as the *Quakers*, if not more: *First*, By their *Marrying* in their Churches, at which time the Woman is obliged

liged to *Speak* a great many Sentences. 2dly, By their *Baptizing* in their Churches, where the *God-mother*, so called, is necessitated to speak. 3dly, In their *Catechizings*. 4dly, In their *Singings*. 5thly, In their saying of their *Common-Prayers*, &c. Do not the Women at such times, speak as well as the Men? If so, we are apt to think, that those (who are as culpable, as they suppose us) are not proper Persons to reprehend us, for acting such things as they injoin their Followers to do.

If any shall take the liberty to say, that the word *Speak*, in these Texts, is to be taken in a lax sense; and that the forming of all Articulate Sounds in the Church by Women, is not thereby absolutely prohibited; but only Teaching or Preaching: Let such know, that we do not esteem Assertions, without good Proof in this case, of any Validity; therefore shall not account them worth our notice, unless they are accompanied with Probable Reasons or Convincing Arguments.

The words cited by *J. S.* out of *Timothy*, *Let the Woman learn in silence, with all subjection.* We desire, that not our Women only, but our Men also, may learn in silence, and be obedient and subject to their Instructors: Seeing this Sentence respects *Learners*, and not *Teachers*, how it oppugns Women's Preachings, I do not perceive; nor the following Verse, which is, *I suffer not a Woman to teach, nor to usurp Authority over the Man, but to be in silence: Man* here, is to be considered as a Synonymous Term with *Husband*, and is often so used in our, and the *Dutch Language*; then the Translation will

run thus, *I suffer not a Woman to teach, nor to usurp Authority over her Husband.* This is a Doctrine, that we have always approved of; never countenancing Women in assuming a Power to teach their Husbands, or in usurping an Authority over them. From the Context, I conclude, that this Precept only respects Women in a married State. The Apostle goes on, and subjoyns some Reasons, why the *Wife* should not assume a Superiority over her *Husband*; but not one Syllable against Women's Preachings: The *first* respects his Creation, *For Adam*, saith he, *was first formed, then Eve.* The *second* is deduced from her being first in the Transgression, *Adam was not*, says he, *deceived, but the Woman.* In fine, from the precedent and subsequent Words of the Apostle *Paul*, from his Sayings in other places, and from his Instance of a Man and his Wife, I no ways hesitate to conclude, that this Text only respects a Woman, as she is in a married State, and not as she is a Member of a Christian Society.

Having thus considered the first part of what was proposed, I shall now proceed to the Second, *viz.* To shew, that some terms in *1 Cor. 14. 34.* and *1 Tim. 2. 12.* will bear a Construction different from that which is generally annexed to 'em: According to the usual Interpretation of the Original Terms, they may be translated thus, *Let your γυναῖκες Wives keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them λαλεῖν to speak rashly or inconsiderately; but they are commanded to be under Obedience, as also saith the Law: And if they will*

learn

learn any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home; for it is a shame for Women λαλεῖν to tattle in the Church. Let the Woman learn ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ in quietness, with all subjection. But I suffer not γυνὴ a Wife to teach, nor to usurp Authority over ἀνδρὸς her Husband, but to be ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ in quietness.

This Passage to the Corinthians is thus interpreted by Miles Coverdale, in his Bible printed at Paris, Anno 1540. Let your Wives keep silence in the Congregation; for it shall not be permitted unto them to speak, but to be under Obedience; as the Law saith also: But if they will learn any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home; for it becometh not Women to speak in the Congregation. Wives being a Relative term to Husbands, and Husbands following just after, I conceive, it's more proper to translate γυναῖκες here with Miles Coverdale, Wives, than to follow our common Version, where it is translated Women.

To demonstrate, that these words will bear the signification which is here given them, I shall produce several Authorities.

Λαλεῖν saith Leigh in his Crit. Sacr. is vulgarly taken in the evil part, and signifieth, Temerè & inconsideratè verba fundere, effutire. Scapula in his Lexicon affirms, That this Verb Plerumque ponitur pro temerè & inconsideratè verba fundere. Henricus Stephanus, in his Thesaurus Lingua Graecae, is of the same opinion. In this sense it is used by Plutarch, De Alcib. λαλεῖν ἀριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν. Budaeus saith in his Lexicon, that λαλεῖν Sape in malam partem accipitur, ut sit temerè & inconsideratè citraque delectum aliquem verba effutire.

ῥων is commonly in the New Testament translated *Wife*, as in *Mat.* 1. 20. *Titus* 1. 6. *Rev.* 21. 9. and in *1 Cor.* 9. 5.

Ἡσυχία commonly signifies *quietness*; Dr. *Hammond's* Marginal Reading renders it so here; and it is so translated in *2 Theff.* 3. 12. and the *Lexicons* give it the same sense.

Ἀνδρός the Genitive Case of *ἄνθρωπος* in several places of the New Testament, is rendered *Husband*, as in *Rom.* 7. 2. *1 Cor.* 7. 39. and *14. 35.* and Dr. *Hammond's* Marginal Reading has it so here.

These Authorities, I hope, will skreen me from any just Censure of my Opponent, on account of my translating the words of the Apostle to the *Corinthians*, and to *Timothy*, as I have done them: If so, it naturally follows that these Texts of Scripture do not in the least affect such Women, as are moved to preach by a *Divine Impulse*; but only such Tatlers, Proposers of Questions, and Speakers as have no *special Afflatus* to Commissionate them in their Speakings, Preachings, or Propheying: We are Advocates for the first, but not for the latter Set of Women.

After an Enervation of the Objections against *Women's Preachings*, it may not be impertinent to consider the Texts of Scripture, the Action of some Women therein mentioned, and the Opinions of our Predecessors, that seem to countenance their *Preachings*.

From *Paul's* Directions concerning *Women's Head-dresses*, when they were *Praying* or *Propheying*, it may be rationally concluded, that they were permitted to *Pray* and *Prophefy*; for

had they been universally prohibited these Religious Acts, would the Apostle have given Directions how Women should demean themselves, when they were *Praying* or *Prophefying*, if they were not to be permitted to pray or prophesie? But that such Directions are given, is undeniable from 1 Cor. 11. where it is said, *Every Woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her Head uncovered, dishonoureth her Head.* Hence we infer, that according to the Apostle's Judgment in this case, a Woman, who, by a *divine Impulse*, prayeth or prophesieth in the Church, may be defended; and consequentially speak, because *Praying* and *Prophefying* cannot be performed without speaking. What it is to *Pray*, is obvious to most; but what it is to *Prophesie*, in an Apostolical Sense, is not so apparent: Therefore I shall concisely explain it here. The Greek word *προφητεύω* is variously sensed, To foretell future Events; To declare the Will of God to any, as Commissionated by him; To expound or interpret the Scriptures, to the Edification of the Church, as in 1 Cor. 14. 1. *Desire spiritual Gifts, but rather that ye may prophesie.* 1 Cor. 14. 3. *He that prophesieth, speaketh unto Men, for their Edification, and Exhortation, and Comfort.* And 1 Cor. 14. 4. *He that prophesieth, edifieth the Church.* In this sense it is commonly taken in the Epistles of Paul. Then I shall translate 1 Cor. 11. 5. *Thus, Every Woman that prayeth, or expoundeth the Scriptures, with her Head uncovered, dishonoureth her Head.* And *Praying* and *Expounding the Scriptures* are very aptly joyned together,

ther; because one of them, generally in places of publick Worship, precedes the other. If any oppose this Interpretation, let them consult *Hammond, Leigh, Scapula, &c.* and they will find, these Authors concur with me therein.

Some may perhaps object, That if this is the genuine sense of this Text, it is contradicted in the same *Epistle*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35, where the Apostle saith, *It is not permitted unto them to speak.—It is a shame for Women to speak in the Church.* These may consider, that the Original Word, which is translated *speak*, often signifies, to *speak inconsiderately, rashly, impertinently, &c.* So that without the appearance of a Contradiction, Women may be admitted to pray, or to expound the Scriptures, when assisted thereunto by the holy Spirit; yet opposed when they speak inconsiderately, rashly, or impertinently.

We are not without Instances in the New Testament of Women that were Preachers; as the *Woman of Samaria*, by whose Preaching many of the Samaritans believed, *John* 4. 39. The Resurrection of Christ was first preached by a Woman, *John* 20. 18. Paul had Women that laboured with him in the Gospel, *Phil.* 4. 3. In the same Verse, *Clement* is called his *Fellow-Labourer*: That this Man was a Preacher, and on that account called his *Fellow-Labourer*, I am inclined to believe, none will deny. Why then Women, which are said to have laboured with him in the Gospel, were not also Preachers, but that can, let him give me a Reason for it. *Priscilla*, and her Husband, expounded unto *Apollos*

the way of God more perfectly, Acts 18. 26. Here is a Woman that taught a Man, and was not reprov'd for it; but is greeted by Paul with the term *Fellow-helper in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 16. 3.

As there were Women that preached, so there were some that prophesied, and spake in the Church, as *Anna*; of whom it is said, That she was a *Prophetess*, and abode in the Temple, and spake of Christ to all them that looked for Redemption in Jerusalem, Luke 2. 38. Here is a Woman that preached Christ, even in the Temple, to all them that looked for Redemption in Jerusalem. Philip had four Daughters that did prophesie: Can it be supposed, they did it without speaking, or in a Corner by themselves? Certainly no; but in some publick Assemblies, where what they instrumentally delivered from God, might be the more publickly known. *Huldah* was a *Prophetess*, and dwelt in a Colledge, 2 Kings 22. 14. *Deborah* was a *Prophetess*, and judg'd Israel, Judg. 4. 4. *Miriam* was a *Prophetess*, and sang Praises to the Lord, with all the Women of Israel, for their Deliverance from the Egyptians, Exod. 15. 20. From these Examples of God's Love to Females, it is undeniable, that they have been favoured with the Gift of his Spirit in former times, and have spoken in the Assemblies of his People: Why such should be debarred now, when moved by an extraordinary Impulse to declare the Words of the Lord to his Servants, he that hath any Rational Arguments to object against it, let him produce them.

In the Days of the Apostles, and several Centuries after, there were *Deaconesses* in the Churches of Christ; whereof *Phœbe*, mentioned in *Rom. 16. 1.* was one; of whom it is there said by the Apostle, *I commend unto you Phœbe our Sister*, *ἡ αὐτὴ διακονοῦσα*, which is a *Deaconess* of the Church which is at *Cenchrea*: And she has the same Title given her in the Postscript of that *Epistle*. Our common Version renders it *Servant* in both places, but in the Original 'tis *Deaconess*; as any one, that understands the *Greek Tongue*, must acknowledge. The Office of a *Deacon*, saith *Dr. Hammond*, is to wait on the Bishop, to Preach, to Read the Gospel, to Administer to the Necessities of the Poor, &c. If this was the Duty of a *Deacon*, as probably 'twas, why not also of a *Deaconess*? Seeing they both have the same Name in the *New Testament*, may we not probably conclude, their Offices were alike? That they did sometimes Teach, is evident from *William Cave's* words: *Sometimes* (says he) *the Deaconesses were employed in instructing the more Rude and Ignorant sort of Women, in the plain and easie Principles of Christianity.*

*Prim.
Christ.
Part 1.
Chap. 8.
p. 157.
Cl. Alex.
Strom. 1.
3. p. 448.*

From this Man's Testimony, it is apparent, that *Women* did sometimes teach, and consequently speak. If the *Rector* shall oppose the *Deaconesses* having the same Stations in the Churches, that the *Deacons* had: I shall desire him to demonstrate, wherein the Office of a *Deaconess* differed from that of a *Deacon*. Can it, with any shadow of a Reason, be supposed, that there were any Officers in the Churches, who were not permitted to speak in them? Surely no:

Then

Then the seeming Prohibition against *Womens* speaking, contained in 1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. is not to be taken in a strict, but in a qualified Sense.

After these Instances taken out of the Scriptures, concerning Women that spoke in the Church, and in publick Assemblies, it may not be impertinent to cite some Examples of Women, that were Instrumental for the Conversion of Nations, by Preaching the Doctrine of Jesus Christ to Infidels, in the first Ages of Christianity.

About the Year 327. there was a Woman, as *Socrates Scholasticus* reports, by whom the *Iberians* were Converted to the Christian Faith; after she had Converted the King and Queen, the King preached Christ to the Men, and the Queen preached him to the Women.

*Lib. i.
Cap. 16.*

*Was not
here a
Womans
Meeting*

Baronius, in his *Annals*, taking notice of the Conversion of the *Iberians*, relates it much after the same manner, and affirms, that *Credunt viri per Regem, famine per Reginam*: The Men were instructed in the Christian Religion by the King, and the Women by the Queen.

*Tom. iii.
P. 375.*

In the Year 372. says *Baronius*, there was a Queen of the *Saracens*, called *Mauvia*, who preached Christ to her Subjects; his words are, *Dum negat Romanus Imperator Fidem Catholicam, & confientes illam ignominiis afficit direque persequitur, proficitur eam & predicat Regina Saracenorum*: At a time, when the Roman Emperor denied the Chatholick Faith, and discountenanced those that professed it, and violently persecuted them, a Queen of the *Saracens* embraced and preached it.

*Ann.
Tom 4.
P. 345.*

In

Tom. 6.
p. 531.

In the Year 499. saith the same Author, was a *Queen* of the *Franks* in *Gallia*, named *Chrotildis* (a *Burgundian*) by whom that Nation was Converted: That she was a *Preacher*, appears from the words of *Gregory Turonensis*, lib. 2. cap. 30. *De gestis Francorum*, and cited by *Baronius*; *Regina non cessabat predicare*, &c. The *Queen* ceased not to *preach*, &c. This, and the two following Instances, were communicated to me by my Friend *Richard Clarridge*.

Tom. 7.
p. 600.

In the Year 583. flourished *Ingundis*, *Queen* of the *Goths* in *Spain*, by whom her Husband and Subjects were Converted, as *Baronius* affirms, whose words are, *Capit Ingundis predicare Viro suo*, &c. *Ingundis* began to *preach* to her Husband, &c.

Tom. 8.
p. 29.

In the Year 591. says *Paulus Diaconus*, l. 4. c. 2. (according to the Testimony of *Baronius*) lived *Theodolinda*, a *Queen* of the *Longobards* in *Italy*, by whose *Preaching* that Nation was Converted; his words are, *Magnum a Deo per Theodolindam Reginam consecutos esse beneficium*, &c. *Regem ipsum*, & *sub eo positos Longobardos*: Both the King himself, and his *Longobard-Subjects*, obtained a great Favour from God, by the *Preaching* of *Queen Theodolinda*; namely, their Conversion to the Christian Faith.

Here we have a Relation of the *Preaching* of five *Queens*, signally owned in their Ministry, and recorded for Example to their Sex in after-Ages. And if our Adversaries should object against the Relator, *Baronius*, because a *Papish Cardinal*, and one that hath stuffed his *Annals* with many False and Legendary Stories: I think this is Answer sufficient to the Objection, That if he

had endeavoured to impose upon us here, he had but weakened the *Roman Cause* thereby; that Church being as much against *Womens Preaching*, as the Church J. S. professes himself to be a Minister of.

In the 99th Canon of the Council of *Nice*, held 325. Women are reckoned amongst the Clergy; the words, as translated, are, *De Diaconissis, & omnibus, qui in Clero censentur*: Concerning Deaconesses, and all others who are accounted amongst the Clergy.

In the Fifteenth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* (commonly called the Fourth General Council) assembled *Anno 451*. is this Passage, Διακονίσσαν μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναῖκα πρὸ ἑλῶν τεσσαράκοντα; A Deaconess is not to be Ordained, before she is Forty Years Old.

About this time, the Clergy degenerating from their former Simplicity, but increasing in Power, Riches, and Worldly Grandeur: He was accounted Happy, who had a Friend at Court, whereby he might attain some Ecclesiastical Preferment, great Revenues, Titles and Honours being annexed to 'em, many were ambitious of obtaining them: Then the Men (exiling the Women) by degrees took the sole Government of the Church into their own Hands; and assembling together, made wth Canons they pleased for their Secular Advantage, &c. Then were some published against the Ordination of Priestesses, Deaconesses, &c. From these Synodical Prohibitions, we may reasonably conclude, that such Practices were then in use: For had there been no such Customs, doubtless the Councils would not have repeatedly

peatedly prohibited it. But that they did so, is undeniable from the following Instances :

The Eleventh Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, held, about the Year 319. orders, *That Priestesses should not be ordained in the Church*, Du Pin Eccl. Histor. Vol. 2. p. 269.

The First Canon of the Council of *Saragosa*, assembled *Anno 381. Forbids Women to meddle with Teaching, and expounding Articles of Faith*, Du Pin Eccl. Histor. Vol. 2. p. 274.

In the 99th Canon of the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, held *Anno 398.* is this Sentence, *Mulier, quamvis docta & sancta, viros in Conventu docere non presumat* : A Woman, tho' she may be learned and holy, should not presume to teach the Men in an Assembly.

The Twenty-sixth Canon of the Council of *Orange*, assembled *Anno 441.* prohibits the Ordination of *Deaconesses*; the words are, *Diaconas omnimodis non ordinanda; siquæ jam sunt, Benedictioni quæ populo impenditur capita submittant* : *Deaconesses* are not to be ordained for the future; but if there are any already Consecrated, they are to receive the Blessing with the Laicks.

The Twenty-first Canon of the Council of *Epaone*, assembled *Anno 517.* Forbids the Consecration of *Deaconesses*, in these words, *Viduarum consecrationem, quas Diaconas Vocitant, ab omni regione nostra penitus abrogamus* : We do altogether prohibit the Consecration of Widows, which are called *Deaconesses*, in all our Provinces.

About this time, Women were also prohibited in certain places to come near the Altar,

Altar, as is demonstrable from 44th Canon of the *Laodicean Council*, where it is said,

ἡ δὲ δὲ γυναῖκες ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ἐισέρχασθαι;
Women ought not to come near the Altar.

Gelasius the First, who was Pope of Rome, Anno 492. favours the like Sentiments, as is evident from his Ninth Epistle, directed to the Bishops of *Lucania, Samnium, and Sicily*; where I find the following Clause, *Nihilominus impatienter audivimus tantum divinarum re-*
rum subiisse despectum, ut Feminae sacris Altaribus ministrare ferantur: 'We have heard, with a great deal of impatience, that the holy Mysteries have been so much slighted, that Women have ministred at the sacred Altars.'

In the Fifth Century, Women in most places were denied all Ecclesiastical Offices, and commanded to be silent in the Churches; and so it continued for several Centuries, even till the *Ancient Faith* began to bud forth again (after that great Night of Apostacy) amongst the *Waldenses*, who justified Womens Preachings, which some *Protestants*, &c. their Successors, have also done; as the ensuing Quotations will substantially prove.

Bernardus Abbas Fontis Calidi, who lived about the Year 1180. writ his Eighth Chapter against the *Waldenses*, for their maintaining, That Women might preach, *Bibl. Patr. Tom. 4. p. 1220.*

Reinerius, a Papist, who flourished about the Year 1254. affirms, That it was the opinion of the *Waldenses*, that *Omnis Laicus & etiam Femina debeat predicare*: Any Layman or Woman might preach, *Bibl. Patr. Tom. 13. p. 300.*

In

Book of
Martyrs,
Vol. I.
p. 869.

In the Year 1428. there was one *Joan White* (the Wife of *William White* a Martyr) who, according to the Testimony of *John Fox*, preached her Husband's Doctrine; his words are, *Following her Husband's footsteps, according to her power, teaching and sowing abroad the same Doctrine, confirmed many in God's Truth; wherefore she suffered much Trouble and Punishment at the hands of the Bishop.*

P. 287.

William Tindal, that famous Martyr, in his Answer to *Sir Thomas Moor*, says, That Women may Baptize, in case of need; yea, and Teach, and Rule their Husbands too, if they be besides themselves: Yea, in another place he saith, if Histories be true, Women have preached since the opening of the New Testament.

P. 252.

Luther (says *Ro. Barclay*) affirmed, That it was wickedly done of them (Romish Clergy) to assume to themselves only this Authority to Teach and be Priests and Ministers, &c. For, says he Every good Christian (not only Men, but even Women also) is a Preacher.

In *Vetere Testamento* (saith *Grotius* on 1 Cor. 11. 5.) *Famine fuere Προphetissæ, (Prophetissa) ut Maria, soror Moysis, Exod. 15. 20. Debora, Jud. 4. 4. Uxor Esaie, cap. 8. 3. Holda, 2 Reg. 22. 14. Ita & in Novo, ut Filia Philippi, Act. 21. 9. & alia postea. Solebant autem tales etiam publicè Prophetias sacras exponere, ut apparet dictis, Veteris Test. locis. Quare quod Paulus vetat Fæminas docendi munere fungi infra, 14. 34. intelligendum illud cum exceptione, nisi speciale Dei mandatum habeant.*

'In the Old Testament (saith *Grotius* on 1 Cor. 11. 5.) were Women who were Pro

phetesses, as *Mary the Sister of Moses, Exod.*
 15. 20. *Deborah, Judg. 4. 4.* The Wife of
Isaiah, chap. 8. 3. *Hulda, 2 Kings 22. 14.*
 So also in the New Testament, as the
 Daughters of *Philip, Acts 21. 9.* and others
 also. These were wont publickly to ex-
 pound the holy Prophets, as appears from
 the fore-cited places of the Old Testa-
 ment. Wherefore Paul's forbidding Women to
 exercise the Gift of Teaching, beneath in 14.
 34. is to be understood with an Excep-
 tion, Unless they have a special Command from
 God.

Estius, a Papist, acknowledges in his Com-
 mentaries on 1 Cor. 11. 5. that Women
 did sometimes speak in publick Assemblies;
 his words are, *Ostendit hic locus Mulieres Pro-*
phetasse in Conventu publico: This place shews,
 that Women have prophesied in the publick
 Assembly.

Pool, in his *Synop. Crit.* (on the same Text,
 says) *Num ergo Mulieres permittit Apostolus in*
Ecclesia docere contra mandatum, 1 Cor. 14. 34.
resp. intelligendum illud cum exceptione nisi speciale
Dei mandatum habeant Prophetarunt quandoque Mu-
lieres in Ecclesia primitiva in Conventu publico.

Pool, in his *Annotations* on 1 Cor. 14. 34. he is
 positive, that this Rule must be restrained to ordi-
 nary Propheysings: For certainly (saith he) if
 the Spirit of Prophecy came upon a Woman in
 the Church, she might speak. *Anna*, who was a
 Prophetess in the Temple, gave Thanks to the Lord,
 and spake of him to all them that looked for Re-
 demption in Israel. And I cannot tell how *Philip's*
Daughters prophesied, if they did not speak in the
 presence of many, Acts 21. 9. The

The same Author affirms, in his *Annotations* on 1 Cor. 11. 5. That *though the Woman, 1 Tim. 2. 12. be forbidden to Teach, and commanded to be in Silence; yet that Text must be understood of ordinary Women, and in ordinary Cases; not concerning such as prophesied from an Extraordinary Impulse, or Motion, of the Spirit: We read of Women Prophetesses both in the Old and New Testament, &c.*

After these Proofs, that *Womens Preachings* are no Novelties, nor contrary to any Text of Scripture; I shall proceed to speak a few words in favour of their Meetings by themselves. That there were, in the first Centuries of Christianity, *Deaconesses* in most Churches, is undeniable; their business was, to take care of the Poor, &c. Doubtless these had their Meetings (whether they met separately by themselves, or promiscuously with the Men, I am not positive) for the better supplying the Necessities of those that were in want. Should I admit, that the Women, in the first Ages of Christianity, had no Meetings distinct from the Mens, might not these promiscuous Assemblies be accompanied with several Inconveniencies? To prevent these for the future, might they not agree to assemble in separate places, where the Men might have a greater liberty to speak concerning the Necessities and Infirmities of the Men; and the Women, in like manner, might discourse more freely of the Necessities and Infirmities of their Sex, and so provide for them accordingly? Many Alterations have been made in the Discipline of the Churches, and nothing hath been
more

more common, than to adapt it to the Circumstances of the People, that have been Converted; and this hath been done, without an Imputation of *Heresie*, by many Christians, who have been famous in their Generations; even by those whom, I am satisfied, the *Rector* will not scruple to recognize as such, nor affirm, that in so doing, *They acted not according to the Mind and Counsel of God, nor did it in the ordering and leading of his Eternal Spirit*. In treading in the steps of our Predecessors, are we more to be blamed than they? May we not have Womens Meetings separate from the Mens, for the benefit of the Poor, &c. without being scoffed at? Has there not been, in former times, greater Alterations in the Discipline of the Churches, than this is? If there has not, prove it; if there has, desist for the future to Ridicule us on this Score. That there were *Deaconesses* amongst the Christians for several Centuries, is undeniable from what I have already said, and from the following Instance.

Du Pin, in the Second Volume of his *Ecclesiastical History*, affirms, That in the Fourth Century, *there were Deaconesses in almost all Churches*. P. 290.

Before I close this Discourse, concerning *Womens speaking* in the Church, permit me to propose a Query to J. S. and his Brethren: Do you not grant, that a Woman hath been, is, or may be, the supream Head and Governour of your Church? If you do admit this, as possible, then give me your Sentiments, whether the Head of any Society, when they are assem-

bled together, may not be permitted to speak in that Assembly, when some of its Members are tolerated? Is it reasonable that the Governour should be prohibited the liberty of Speech, when the Governed are permitted to speak? Is it just, that the Superiours should be denied those Priviledges, which their Inferiours enjoy? Such like Tenets are, in my opinion, inconsistent; if the *Rector* can, let him reconcile them.

P. 80. He subjoyns, *Now if the Quakers did not prefer Fox's Orders above the Authority of the Scriptures, surely these exprefs words of an Apostle might have given some check to these Female Inspirado's.*

We do not prefer *Fox's Orders* (as he tauntingly calls them) above the Scriptures, nor equalize them with the Sayings of our Saviour his Apostles, &c. tho' agreeable thereto: Yet we believe his Advice is to be followed and observed by us; and on that account, we pay a respect to them. The exprefs words of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 11. 5.* are a sufficient warrant for Women, who are divinely Inspired, to speak in the Church, or in any other publick Assembly: And that several Learned Protestants and others, agree with us therein, I have abundantly proved in the foregoing Sheets therefore shall wave its farther Consideration here.

P. 81. *Indeed both these Projects (Womens Preaching, and Womens Meetings) were at first set on foot by Fox.*

Notwithstanding the assurance, with which this Passage is penned, it's a great Untruth

say, that G. F. was the first Institutor, or Defender, of Womens Preachings. We are satisfied, that this was practised by the *Primitive Christians*, and is as Ancient as Christianity it self. But that it's of an Elder Date than G. F.'s Birth, is undeniable from the Testimonies lately produced.

Near the foot of this Page, mention is made of one *Solomon Eccles*, whom my Adversary, after a ridiculing manner, stiles *their famous Prophet*.

He was never accounted by us, as a famous Prophet.

He goes on, and says, *S. E. writ a Letter to one John Story,—wherein he calls Womens Meetings and Womens Preachings, the good Ordinances, which Jesus Christ has set up in his Church.*

'Tis possible this may be true: What *Heretic* is there in these words? Had he concluded his Discourse with this Passage, we should not have censured him for it; neither would he have had any cause to have grieved for it, as he was for saying, *This is the Word of the Lord to thee, That this Year, thou (John Story) shalt die, because thou hast taught Rebellion against the Living God.* Note, He did not say, because thou hast opposed *Womens Meetings and Womens Preachings*, as J. S. suggests; but because thou hast taught Rebellion against the Living God. *Solomon Eccles* condemned this Act, and acknowledged under his own hand, that he spoke these words in an *angry Spirit*; that he had had little Rest, day nor night, at times, ever since he spake them; that it sorely grieved him; and that he bore God's Indignation for it. He that hath the Curiosity

to see his own Condemnation at length, may read it in *Babylonish Opposer*, p. 8.

What Society of People is there, that hath not had some forward and unruly Spirits amongst them? Must all be censured for the unaccountable Acts of a few? May we conclude universally, from some particular Instances? If this liberty is to be taken, then no Christian Society will be Justifiable. Are the *Ministers* of the *Church of England*, so called, unspotted in this respect? Have not there been amongst them *Simonists*, *Drunkards*, *Adulterers*, *Murderers*, *Clippers*, *Coyners*, &c? Would J. S. commend me, if I should instance some of these, and thereby endeavour to sully the Reputation of the rest? It was a Saying of the
 v. 28. Wise Man, That *whoſo Confesseth and Forsaketh his Sins, ſhall have Mercy*. Should not God be more Compassionate on the Penitent Sinners than this Rector is, who could stand in the Day of Judgment? Our Creator willingly pardons those that have sinned against him when they Confess and Forsake their Sins. But this Man will continue Calumniating S. B. and the Communion of which he was a Member, notwithstanding he hath publicly Confessed his Transgression. There was a Lying Prophet in the days of old; are the true ones therefore to be reflected on? Certainly no.

Sixty-Six of Fox's Admirers in London, threatened out a formal Excommunication against Story Wilkinson, and a great many other Quakers, for not submitting to the Laws of their great Apostle particularly about their Womens Meetings.

This Passage is published with a great deal of Confidence; yet if I may take liberty to examine the Truth of the particulars therein mentioned, several Mistakes will appear. It is said, that *Sixty-Six of Fox's Admirers in London, thundred out a formal Excommunication, &c.* If by *Fox's Admirers in London*, is intended, those that inhabit in and near *London*, as by his calling them, in the following Period, the *City Party*, his words seem to imply, he is in an Error; for that Testimony against *J. S.* and *J. W.* was drawn up by the Order of the *Yearly Meeting*, and subscribed by its Members, who are chiefly Country Men; whose business is, to take care of the Discipline of the Church, Necessities of the Poor, &c. How those, who dwell in the remote parts of this Nation, can be called the *City Party*, let the Judicious determine.

As to their *thundring out a formal Excommunication against Story, Wilkinson, and a great many others*; the *Rector* would do well to inform us, in what terms this *formal Excommunication* was delivered: For I do profess, tho' I have read that Paper over and over, signed by the *Sixty-Six*, yet do not find any *formal Excommunication* in it, against *Story, Wilkinson*, or any other Person. Who are intended under the extensive words, *a great many others*, is to me a Secret; there is no Body specified by Name, but *J. Story* and *J. Wilkinson*. He that can inform me, without *J. S.*'s assistance, who those *great many others* are, who were *formally Excommunicated*, they will tell me what, at present, I am ignorant of.

The Reasons assigned by my Adversary, for the *formal Excommunication* (as he calls it) of *J. Story, J. Wilkinson*, and a great many others, is, because they would not submit to the *Laws of their great Apostle*, particularly about their *Womens Meetings*: Here also is a mistake; for it was not, because they would not submit to the *Laws of their great Apostle* (as his Phrase is) or for their opposing *Womens Meetings*, that our Friends of the *Yearly Meeting* testified against them: But, 1. For setting up a kind of a *Standard of Separation*. 2. For rejecting the *Sense and Admonition* of the last *Yearly Meeting*. 3. For going on in their *Opposition and Evil-smiting* against the *Faithful Brethren*, &c. 4. For refusing to dissolve their *separate Company*. 5. For offering their *Gifts*, before they were reconciled to their *Brethren*. These are the *Motives* specified in the *Paper*, upon which the *Yearly Meeting* proceeded against *J. S. and J. W.* and there is not one tittle therein against *Womens Meetings*, notwithstanding my Opponent instanceth that, as the particular Cause of it. One that takes such an unwarrantable liberty in publishing *Untruths in Fact*, will thereby, in the Eyes of the Considerate, render his Discourse, even when he speaks the Truth, suspicious.

P. 82. How can these Men set up for *Infallibility*, who have been so miserably deceived themselves? And what greater Proof can there be of this, than their accusing and condemning one another with their contrary Bulls of *Excommunication*?

We never entertained any Thoughts, that we were *Infallible*, as Men, abstractly considered. The *Infallibility* we have pleaded for, was that

of the Spirit; and esteemed our selves only so, in following its Dictates : Therefore our Adversary doth us great Injustice, in suggesting here, that we predicate that of the Man, which we attribute to the Holy Spirit, which tabernacles in, and guides its true Followers into all Truth, infallibly Conducting them in the Way of Salvation.

We grant, that these Men, *who have been miserably deceived themselves, are not fit to set up for Infallibility* : The Query then will be, Which of these two opposite Parties is in the right ? It hath been the general opinion of all sincere Friends, that the Advice of the *Yearly Meeting* is to be observed ; then the Actions of *Story, Wilkinson, &c.* who opposed it, are to be condemned. We should have paid as great a deference to our Paper, had it been only signed by *One*, as now 'tis by *Sixty-Six* : Had their Paper been signed by an Hundred more than ours, we should not have esteemed it the better for the Number of its Subscribers. There were enough to ours, to shew the Unanimity of that General Assembly, and that is all we look at. Had it been our method to determine things by the Majority of Voices, we could easily have out-voted them. It is, and hath been our Custom, to advise those, that profess to be of our Communion, to submit to its Discipline : But if they will not, after several Admonitions, then to signify, that for their opposing the good Advice repeatedly given them, we do no longer esteem them of our Society : This was done to *Story, Wilkinson*, and several others who joyned with them ; but

they continuing in their Gain-saying, we published that Paper against them; for which Act, we conceive our selves Justifiable both in the sight of God and Man. As to the Number of those, who signed a Paper in opposition to ours, we regard it not; for all disorderly Spirits, who reject our Christian Advice, whatever their Pretences may be, we place them under the same Predicament. That *Story* and his Followers were guided by a wrong Spirit, we have not only the Unanimous Opinion of our Annual Assembly, but the concurring Sentiments of a great many of those, who at first joyned with them; but afterwards, having a sense of their Spirit, and being made sensible of their own State and Condition, they repented, and gave forth Condemnation against themselves under their hands, because they had joyned with them in the Separation; and we hope the Lord will bring others of them to the like Sense. On these Considerations, doubtless, we may, without any Injustice to the Separatists, conclude they were mistaken, and consequently to be censured, for their Endeavours to disturb the Peace of the Church.

P. 83. *They all agree,—with one consent, to clamour against Water-Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which have ever been acknowledged by all the Christian World, to be of divine Institution.*

To affirm, that *Water-Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, have ever been acknowledged to be of divine Institution, by all the Christian World, may be done without any difficulty; but to prove it, is a greater Undertaking, and requires more time for its performance: When

due

due Proof is made, I shall give Credit to this Passage; till then, if I suspend my Judgment, I hope J. S. will not be angry. *All the Christian World*, is a place of a large Extent; and to have determinate Ideas of the Sentiments of all its Inhabitants, would argue him to be a great Traveller, or a prodigious Reader; neither of which Qualifications, in my opinion, can be attributed to my Opponent. For had he been well acquainted with the Ecclesiastical Histories of *France, Italy, Flanders, and Germany*; which Countries, no doubt, may be included within the Extensive Terms, *All the Christian World*, he would have different Notions from these he now entertains. And to convince my Adversary, that he is in an Error, I shall recite some Opinions, that were embraced by certain People inhabiting these Countries.

In the Year 1017. as History relates, were several Canonicks burnt at *Orleans*, for maintaining, that *Baptism did not procure the Remission of Sins*; that the *Consecration by the Priest did not constitute the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, &c. At the Synod of *Arras*, Anno 1025. were some that held, that *Baptism and the Supper were not necessary for the attaining of Salvation*. In the 12th Century, were a Society of People, called *Cathari*, who said, that *Baptism with Water is of no avail, and that the Body of Jesus Christ is not consecrated on the Altar*. In the same Age were some, in the Diocess of *Toul*, who *abominated Baptism, and derided the Sacraments*. *Arnold de Brescia*, and his Followers, had much the same Opinions concerning *Baptism and the Eucharist*. *Hugh,*
Arch-

Arch-Bishop of Roan, wrote a Treatise about the Year 1130. against those that *denied the necessity of Baptism, and of the Eucharist.* Amaury, and his Disciples, maintained, that since the time of the Law was past, the Sacraments were *useless*; and that every one is justified by the *Internal Grace of the Holy Spirit.* This Man flourished in the beginning of the 13th Century.

From these Fragments of Antiquity, it is apparent, that J. S. is mistaken in affirming, that *Water-Baptism*, and what he terms the *Lord's Supper*, have ever been acknowledged, by *all the Christian World*, to be of divine Institution. He that is willing to be farther satisfied in these matters, may read *Du Pin*, and other *Ecclesiastical Writers*, where he shall find several Sects among the Christians in former Ages, who favoured the like Opinions.

P. 84. In short, whoever will not believe these things, (that Womens Preachings and Meetings are established by the Power of God) the Quakers affirm, that they are Devils incarnate, Devil-driven and duncy Gods.

I provoke my Adversary, if he hath any spark of common Honesty or Religion remaining, to cite the Book and Page, where the Quakers have affirmed, *Whoever will not believe, that Womens Preachings and Meetings are established by the Power of God, are Devils incarnate, Devil-driven and duncy Gods.* If a Man's Solitary Assertion, is a sufficient Evidence, whose Reputation may not thereby be sullied? To affirm, and not to demonstrate, is an absurd way of Arguing.

Four Lines under the former Passage, are these words, *All this Diabolical Rage and Fury, were vented against their Fellow-Quakers, chiefly* P. 84.
on this very account, because they would not acknowledge Womens Meetings and Preachings to be the Ordinances of Jesus Christ.

In what Book or Place was it Controverted by the *Quakers*? Whether Womens Meetings and Preachings were the Ordinances of Jesus Christ, or no, tell me *John*; because I never heard of such a Controversie amongst us. Some perchance may after this manner Query, Is not a Learned *Rector's* Reputation, sufficient to put a current Stamp on his words? If you expect a more credible Evidence, you may look for it in his Writings till you are tired. My answer is, 'Twas never my method, implicitly to believe any Person, meerly because he asserted a thing, unless it was corroborated by some probable Arguments. To do my Opponent justice, I acknowledge, that he hath made an Essay to prove it in Page 81. of this Treatise, where I have found a Passage, in which 'tis said, *That Solomon Eccles wrote a Letter to one John Story, wherein he called Womens Meetings and Womens Preachings, the good Ordinances which Jesus Christ hath set up in his Church:* To prove this, in the Margin are these words, *See the first part of Babel's Builders.* I have examined this Book, and the *Letter* mentioned, but find not any Passage *in terminis*, as cited by *J. S.* If I should transpose some words, as probably he did, such a Sentence might be composed: But such a liberty being contrary to Justice, and the common Rules of Disputation, I conceive

ceive he will not publicly vindicate it; therefore shall wave it. Had this Passage been in that pretended Letter of S. E. we should not have thought our selves obliged to have taken any notice of it, till it had been better attested, and the whole Letter printed. The Author of that Treatise is one *Thomas Crisp*, who hath been detected of misrepresenting our Friends, and publishing several Falshoods concerning us, by *George Whitehead, J. Field, &c.* and what is there printed, is by its Publisher acknowledged to be only some shred of it. Who from certain Fragments of a Letter, can form positive Ideas of the Intent and Meaning of its Author? Had he really preached, what he is represented to have written, I do not perceive, that from such Premises it could be naturally concluded, that thereby he preached a new Gospel, and consequentially came, as my Adversary suggests, under the *Apostle's Anathema*, who said, *If any Man preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* If Alterations in the Discipline of the Church, are to be accounted a new Gospel, then I will undertake to demonstrate, that *J. S.* and his Fraternity, are far more culpable therein, than we are.

A Line under the last Quotation, he goes on, '*Fox* has set them up, and his *Laws and Orders* are given forth, as *Taylor* hath blasphemously declared, from the Oracles of divine Breath, and ought to be obeyed by all.

The words printed by *J. S.* in an Italick Character, which are, *His Laws and Orders* are

given

given forth from the Oracles of divine Breath, and
 ought to be obeyed by all. On the first reading,
 I took it for a Citation out of Chr. Taylor's
Epistle of Caution, p. 8. But on Examination of
 the Original, I observe no such Passage there:
 What concerns G. F. in that Page, is as fol-
 lows, "Who for his Works sake, in the Gos-
 pel of the Lord Jesus, many do esteem and
 honour, and honourable he is to this day;
 though such as W. R. and his Adherents,
 who (because of Prejudice and Malice) en-
 deavour, what in them lies, to asperse him,
 and abuse him, and contradict his blessed
 Life; in which he is still made Instrumental
 in the hand of the Lord to bring forth Blessed
 Things, for the Service of God and his Truth,
 from the Oracles of the divine Breath, to the
 Praise of his Name for ever. We agree
 with our Friend Taylor, in his Sentiments con-
 cerning G. F. and blush not publicly to ac-
 knowledge, that we do believe, that he was
 endued with Power from on high, made In-
 strumental in the hand of the Lord, for the
 directing of Thousands to the Light of Christ
 in themselves, and that he spake many things
 immediately from the Oracles of the Divine
 Breath: Where is the Blasphemy? And
 where did C. Taylor say, That His (G. Fox's)
*Laws and Orders are given forth from the Oracles
 of the Divine Breath, and ought to be obeyed by
 all?* Let the Rector produce this Citation, or
 confess his Dis-ingenuity in this matter. I am
 perswaded, that Celsus the Epicurean, and Tripho
 the Jew, scorned to traduce their Adversaries
 by such illegal methods; and that they were
 greater

greater Moralists, than to abuse the Primitive Christians by such unwarrantable Practices, as J. S. hath here, and in several other places of his Book, used to misrepresent us. Who, that is not bigotted to a Party, can believe that these methods are proper Mediums to Convince any of their Errors, or to preserve those that are wavering in the true Worship of the God of Israel.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning our Esteem of the holy Scriptures

AS my Opponent made his Essays to blacken our Principles in his former Chapters, by undue Inferences, &c. So he begins this, saying
 P. 86. *The last Consequence I shall at present mention to you, that seems natural to follow from the Quakers Principle of the Light within, is their Contempt of the holy Scriptures.*

Our Principle of the *Light within*, duly considered, will never lead any to undervalue the holy Scriptures, nor the Doctrines therein contained; neither hath it led us, notwithstanding our Enemies false Insinuations to condemn them; but it hath, as sincerely followed, inclined us to esteem and value them, to bless Providence, that we are favoured with the Knowledge of them; to recommend them to all, to be read in their Families; to repeat Passages out of them, in our Gospel-Ministry to desire the Lord to open them to us by his holy

holy Spirit, that we may square all our Actions by 'em, and to prefer 'em before all Books whatsoever.

The Rector goes on, *Whoever carefully examines the Quakers Principles, and compares them with the Doctrine taught by Christ and his Apostles, will have great Reason to believe, that Quakerism could never have got footing amongst us, if the holy Scriptures had been preserved in their due Esteem and Veneration.* P. 86.

It is the greatest of our desires, to have our Principles fairly stated, and compared with the Doctrines taught by Christ and his Disciples: Was this but once impartially done, and publickly exposed to the view of all, I am fully perswaded, that where One doth now, Ten would then, unite themselves to our Society; especially was not the Path of the Righteous too narrow for them to walk in. If the Scriptures are not in so great Esteem and Veneration as they should; let the Priests consider, whether they are not, by their Immoralities, &c. the original Cause of it: For who can imagine, they believe those Doctrines they recommend to their Hearers in their Sermons, when 'tis evident, the Actions of many of them give the Lye to those good Advices they deliver to their Auditory, as the Commands of our Saviour?

The following words are, *Therefore the chief Broachers of this pestilent Heresie, being aware of this, bid open defiance to those sacred Monuments of our most holy Religion; and at first appearance, came with full Cry and open Mouths against them.* P. 86.

According

According to the way, which our Enemies call *Heresie*, worship we the God of our Fathers, believing all things recorded in the holy Scriptures. But that the *first Broachers*, as he ridiculously calls our Ancient Friends, *bid open defiance to those sacred Monuments*, is a notorious Untruth, as with great Facility may be proved. Let any but read these Mens Writings, and then tell me, whether they met with any Writings more confirmed with Texts of Scripture, than these are? Let any considerate Man then give in his Verdict, whether Men, that had the holy Scripture always in their Mouths, and have copiously cited them in their Writings, can be supposed to be Contemners of them? This Notion took footing at first, as I understand, amongst the Commonalty, from some Answers our Friends might give to certain Persons, who, taking the *Bible* in their hands, did frequently say, *This was the Word of God*: To this our Friends might Conscienciously reply, That is Ink and Paper, and is Corruptible; but the *Word of God* is Spiritual, Eternal, and Incorruptible; for which reason, that which thou holdest in thy hand, materially considered, is not the *Word of God*. From such kind of Arguments, some have ignorantly concluded, that we were Despisers of these sacred Writings; than which, nothing can be more false.

P. 87. *The Quakers in effect have done; this is notoriously evident in their denying the Scriptures to be their Rule of Faith and Practice.*

We have always owned the Scriptures to be a Rule, subordinate to the holy Spirit, both of
our

our Faith and Practice, and humbly desire, that all our Actions may be squared accordingly; and we do believe, that they have been and are a Means to convey to us the History and Doctrine of Jesus Christ; and do allow them to be an outward Standard, or Measure, by which, through the assistance of the holy Spirit, we may be capacitated to know what to believe and do, in order to our Salvation.

Hear their great Prophet Burroughs, "You take P. 87.
 up a Command, says he, from the Letter, and
 you say, Christ commands it, when the Letter E. B's
 Works,
 P. 103.
 (meaning the holy Scriptures) "doth but de-
 clare it; but say, in such a Verse of such a Chap-
 ter, such a Command is, not having received the
 Command by the same Spirit.

He that reads this Passage, may perhaps think, that this is a continued Discourse, and that there are no Words or Sentences left out in the Body of this Citation. But to shew the Rector's Dis-ingenuity in this, as in several other places, I shall quote *E. B.* as he words the Subject himself: "You (says he to the *Anabaptists*) take up a Command from the Letter, and imitate the Apostles (some of you in a lower, and some of you in a higher degree) in that Mind and Nature, which in the Apostles was crucified; and you say, Christ commands it, when the Letter doth but declare it; and you are not led with the same Light which gave forth the Commands declared, to observe them; but say, in such a Verse of such a Chapter, such a Command is, not having received the Command by the same Spirit.

In this Page, our Friend tells the *Baptists*, that they were in that Nature which was crucified in the Apostles; notwithstanding they did, in some Externals, imitate them, were Cloathed with their Words, and Followers of their Practices; but these being done in their own Will and Time, were not acceptable to God. You say, that Christ commands this Practice, and the other Observation; whereas the Letter doth but declare, that the Saints, who were led by the same Spirit that gave forth these Commands, observed them to their Eternal Comfort. Your saying, *In such a Verse of such a Chapter, such a Command is*; this will be of no real Benefit to your Souls, until you Experimentally know a receiving of that Command from the same Spirit which at first dictated it. This, doubtless, is the literal Sense of this Quotation: If any doubt thereof, I recommend the Original to their serious Perusal, where the *Rector's* Violation of the Author's Sense will more conspicuously appear.

The Intent and Drift of the Author in this place being considered, it will evidently appear, that he did not censure the *Anabaptists* for taking up a Command from the Letter, in an abstracted Sense; but for taking it up in that Mind and Nature, which in the Apostles was crucified. Will-Worship was what our Friend here condemned: He that will Patronize it, I doubt, is not yet entered into the Fold of Christ; nor he that leaves out the principal Terms in a Passage, merely to misrepresent the Author.

He continues, *Now the Quakers here have, in P. 87.*
to many words, endeavoured wholly to destroy the
Authority of the Scriptures; for you see, they are
resolved not to be convinced of any of their Errors
by the plainest Texts in the Bible.

To say, that we have endeavoured wholly to
 destroy the Authority of the Scriptures, is so great
 an Abuse, and so apparently contrary to our
 Practices, both in our Houses, and in our pub-
 lick Assemblies, that in bearing these Calumnies
 we have this satisfaction; that none, who have
 frequented our Meetings, or had any know-
 ledge of us, or of our Principles, will credit such
 Assertions. As to the latter part of this Pe-
 riod, viz. *You see they are resolved not to be con-*
vinced of any of their Errors by the plainest Texts
in the Bible: This being a Thread of the same
 spinning with the former, may be included
 under the same Category; and we do now, as
 we have formerly, declare, That we are ready
 to submit our Principles to the Test of the
 Holy Scriptures, and to renounce any that can-
 not be defended, or are contrary to them.

A little further, he (E. B.) tells us, that those P. 89.
 are in the Witchcraft, who observe Commands
 without, from the Letter; i. e. in plain English,
 That we are possessed by the Devil, if we obey the
 Laws of God, contained in the Gospel.

According to my Adversary's manner, he
 takes Words in different Comma's, and joyns
 them together, as if they stood ranged in the
 Original, in the same order he cites them:
 This is a Liberty odious in the sight of Moral
 Men, and fair Disputants; whose ultimate desire
 should be, the Conversion of their Opponents.

E. B's
Works,
p. 105.

In Vindication of our Friend, consider his own words, "Here you are proved to be them
" which use your Tongues, and say, He saith
" it ; when God hath not spoken unto you,
" but as you read it without you, as the false
" Prophets may do the Words of the true Pro-
" phets; and thus you are in the **Witchcraft**,
" as they were, *Gal. 3.* who take on things in
" your own Wills, and **observe Commands**
" **without, from the Letter**; thereby draw-
" ing from the Teachings of God within, by
" the Spirit.—They that obeyed Christ, and fol-
" lowed him, were led by the Spirit, and not
" by the Letter ; for they were not Ministers
" of the Letter, but of the Spirit ; and such
" were judged to be in Error: And this is
" your Condition, &c. *Commands* is not to
be taken here indefinitely, but is to be re-
stricted to those only, which draw from the
Teachings of God within, by his holy Spirit.
To argue, *A dicto secundum quid ad dictum Sim-*
pliciter, is apparent Sophistry, and contrary to
the Rules of Disputation. I appeal to the
Moderate of all Perswasions, whether they do
believe that the *Rector's* Inference, viz. *In plain*
English, that we are possessed by the Devil, if we obey
the Laws of God, contained in the Gospel, is the na-
tural result of *E. Burrough's* words, either in a
literal or constructive Sense.

P. 89.

To his Query, *But how come these Men to ima-*
gine, that they shall receive Commands from the same
Spirit, that gave forth the Scriptures?

My Answer is, We do not Imagine, but Ex-
perimentally know, that we have received Com-
mands from the same Spirit, that gave forth the
Scriptures;

Scriptures; and doubt not, but as we continue Faithful to its Teachings, we shall receive many more. And our Faith is, That those, who do not receive a Command to Preach the Gospel, or to Expound the Scriptures, from the same Spirit that gave them forth, but do it in their own Wills, are *Ministers of the Letter*, and not of the Spirit.

His following words are, *We readily grant, that the divine Spirit is necessary to assist our sincere Endeavours for the right understanding the sacred Writings: But what then! Must we therefore expect to receive the Gospel by immediate Revelation?* p. 89.

We are extremely well pleased, to find this Man so ready to grant the Necessity of the Holy Spirit, for the right understanding of the Scriptures: If its assistance is absolutely necessary for the right understanding of these sacred Monuments, certainly 'tis as necessary for those *Ministers*, who would rightly expound 'em. Then how can that Saying of the three *Norfolk Ministers* be true, who boldly assert, That *some* be true *Shepherds*, in relation to their *Flocks*, tho' in relation to God, they may be *Wolves*? Can we suppose, that God will give his Spirit to *Wolves*? If not, how can they rightly understand the sacred Writings? If they do not rightly interpret them, what benefit will it be to the Lambs of God to follow such *Shepherds*? The Princ. of the Quakers p. 17.

The word **Gospel** is variously senced; it naturally signifies any *Good News*, *Glad Tidings*, or *Joyful Message*; by an Excellency, it is restricted to signifie, *The most Joyful Message of*

Salvation, as in *Mark* 1. 15. *Rom.* 10. 15. By a Metonymy, it is taken for the History and Narration of the things which Christ spake and did in the Days of his Flesh, as in *Mark* 1. 1. If I may guess at the Rector's Meaning, I suppose he takes the term *Gospel* here Metonymically; that is, for the History of Christ, as it is represented to us by *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*: If this is his Sense, then I shall intreat him to inform me, which of our Friends ever said, That he expected to receive the *Gospel*, i. e. the Historical Account of Christ, as 'tis penned by the Four Evangelists, by Immediate Revelation, or else he would not receive it at all? This one of our Friends hath said, or 'tis an Inference from his Words; or else J. S. hath done us Injustice in representing it as our Opinion. If one of our Society hath used such an Expression, let him nominate the Person; if it is a natural Consequence from his Words, let him cite the Premises from whence it justly flows. It's possible a Particular may have asserted, That there are Commands in the Scriptures, which he accounts no ways obligatory on him, unless he receives them a-new from the same Spirit, which at first gave them forth: To explain such Passages, we must distinguish between Particular and Universal Commands; some are of General Obligation, as, *To Fear God*, to *Love Him*, and *our Neighbours as our selves*, &c. That these are our Duties, we need no new Revelation to inform us: Others respect Particular Persons and Cases, as, *Isaiah's going naked and bare-foot Three Years*; *Hosea's taking*

P. 90.

Isa. 20. 3.

Hos. 1. 3.

a Wife

a Wife of Whoredom; Peter's going to *Cesarea*; Acts 11. 12. Paul's going to *Macedonia*: Without a special Impulse from the Holy Spirit, we do not esteem these or the like particular Injunctions our Duty, or any ways obligatory on us. But to conclude, meerly because we do not account some particular Commands obligatory, unless we receive them by Immediate Revelation, therefore we will not receive the Gospel, *i. e.* the History of Christ, as declared by the Four Evangelists, unless we receive it by Immediate Revelation, is no natural Inference, nor justly deducible from such Premises.

The Quakers will have the Christian Religion P. 90. revealed to them in the same way, and after the same manner, as the Apostles had, or else they will not receive it at all.

We are verily perswaded, that it's an Indispensible Duty for us, Christians, to believe all things recorded in the *New Testament* concerning our Saviour, &c. if they should never be revealed to us in the same way, or after the same manner, as the *Apostles* and *Evangelists* had them; neither have we at any time said, That we will not receive the *Christian Religion*, unless it is revealed to us by Immediate Inspiration. We bless divine Providence, for favouring us with the knowledge of the holy Scriptures; and do believe all Commands, of an Universal Extent, mentioned in these sacred Writings, are obligatory on us, and on all others, who have had an opportunity of the Explicit Knowledge of these Writings afforded them.

P. 90.

This is the very Reason given us by Mr. Penn, for abolishing Water-Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which he calls Elementary Types and Figures; that such, says he, are not Commandments to us, unless required by the same Spirit anew.

To prove the Truth of this Quotation, in the Margin is cited, *Reason against Railing*, p. 150. I have read the Page cited, and the precedent and subsequent ones, but find not one tittle there concerning *Water-Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. What most resembles that Passage, is, *Those Elementary Types, Shadows and Figures, appointed for a season, and to pass off; that such are not Commandments to us, unless required by the same Spirit anew.* If the Rector will grant, that *Water-Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* are Elementary Types, Shadows and Figures, appointed for a season, and to pass off; then these Words may, in a constructive Sense, be applicable to *Water-Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*: But if he admits not this, I do not see how these terms, even Virtually, can relate to these Ceremonies.

P. 91.

A second Instance I shall give you, of these Men's Contempt of the holy Scriptures, is their denying them to be the Word of God.

If all those, that deny the Scriptures to be properly the *Word of God*, are to be esteemed Contemners of them, we plead guilty to the Indictment: But till our Enemies have proved those sacred Writings, in a collective Sense, are properly the *Word of God*, they do little. We do, and have always granted, that Figuratively, viz. by an *Enallage Numeri*, they may be termed the *Word of God*. Some Essays have

been made by our Opposers, to prove a single Verse, or Sentence in them, to be the *Word of God*; but that is nothing to the Subject under debate: For the Controversie hath not been, Whether a particular Passage in them, is the *Word of God*; but, whether the Bible, collectively considered, is the *Word of God*: When J. S. hath done this, I shall think his Arguments will merit my Observation; till then, if I dismiss them, without any further Reply, I would have him to understand, that 'tis not because they are unanswerable, but because I conceive they are not pertinent, or to the purpose.

He goes on, *G. Whitehead, with Three other P. 51. Quakers, call'd Mr. Townsend, a Minister in Norwich, a Blind Sot, for pretending to prove from the Scriptures, that they are the Written Word of God.*

To prove, that *G. W. &c.* called *Sampson Townsend Blind Sot*, for pretending to prove from the Scriptures, that they are the *written Word of God*, in the Margin, *Ishmael*, p. 17. is cited: I have examined that Book, and find but Thirteen Pages in it; so am uncertain whether *G. W.* and his *Friends*, did really call the *Priest* on that score so, or no: However, seeing the *Rector* positively asserts it, this time I shall credit his bare Affirmation, and take it for granted, that *G. W.* and Three other *Quakers*, did call *S. T. Blind Sot*, for pretending to demonstrate from the Scriptures, that they are the *written Word of God*. In Scripture-Language, such are termed *Blind*, who are Ignorant, and want Knowledge; which is the Eye

Mat. 15. Eye of the Mind, as, *The Blind lead the*
 14. *Blind. Thou thy self art a Guide of the Blind.*
 Rom. 2. And such are termed *Sots*, or *Sottish*, who are

19. foolish, or void of Understanding, as, *For my*
 Jer. 4. 22. *People is Foolish, they have not known me; they*
are Sottish Children, and they have none Under-
standing. In this Sense, according to my weak
 Sentiments, S. T. or any other Person, who
 pretends, from the Letter of the Scriptures,
 to prove, that they (*i. e.* all the Books of the
 Old and New Testament) are the *written Word*
of God, may be justly accounted a *Blind Sot*;
 that is, such a Man as is ignorant, and doth
 not understand those sacred Monuments.

P. 92. *The Laws of God are, in holy Scripture, plainly*
called God's Word.

Who hath opposed this? Certainly none of
 our Friends. We grant, that the Laws of God,
 and the Doctrines therein mentioned, are in holy
 Writ sometimes called the *Word of God*. The
 shortest way, in my opinion, to bring this Con-
 troversie to a period, will be for each Party to
 settle the precise determinate Signification of
 the terms *Word of God*. The Greek Word
 λογος, which in the places * mentioned by the
 Rector, is translated *Word*, signifies also *Reason*,
Speech, *Treatise*, a *Sentence* or *Proposition*, *Com-*
mand, *Doctrine*, *Christ himself*, and several other
 things, which for Brevity I omit. The term
Word, in our Language, is likewise variously
 sensed, and is by us taken for *Speech*, *Account*,
Command, *Law*, *Doctrine*, *Christ*, the *Eternal*
Word, &c. Hence it is possible, that we may
 use the same Articulate Sounds, and at the
 same time form different Ideas in our Minds

* Mark

7. 13.

3 Theff.

2. 13.

con-

concerning them. To remove this Ambiguity in Terms, there is one way, which is to explain the determinate Sense, we annex to this or that particular Term in the Proposition controverted: Should we do this to the term *Word*, in the Sentence under debate, viz. *Whether the Scriptures are the Word of God, or no*, the Difference between us and our Enemies, doubtless, would soon be adjusted. By our Denial of the Scriptures being the *Word of God*, we only mean, that they are not *Christ the Eternal Word of God*; and some of our Opponents, by maintaining they are the *Word of God*, commonly intend (if I may judge by their words) no more, than that *they are the Words or Sayings of God, penned by Men divinely inspired*: In this Sense, we grant, the holy Scriptures may be called the *Word of God*; and I doubt not, but J. S. will subscribe our Opinion, viz. that they are not *Christ the Eternal Word of God*, when he hath a true Idea of our Notions concerning them; tho' some Ministers, in opposition to us, have Blasphemously termed them, **The Sword of the Spirit; the Power of God*: *Nay, God himself.* *Switch, p. 155.

No Arguments have hitherto prevailed with these Men, to own the Scriptures to be the Word of God; yet they have frequently called their own Writings, the Word of the Lord. P. 93.

It's true, no Arguments hitherto used by our Opponents, have been so prevalent, as to Convince us, that the Scriptures may and ought to be properly called the *Word of God*: We can no more imagine, how Ten Thousand Words can be properly called the *Word*, than how P. 92.
Ten

Ten Thousand Men can be properly called the *Man*; when sufficient Reasons can be offered to persuade us of the truth of the latter, we shall readily subscribe the former Proposition; if, till then, we entertain the same Opinions we have hitherto, we hope our Adversaries will not be so severe in Censuring us, as they have formerly been; because we solemnly declare, That it is not the Prejudice of Education, but Scripture and Reason, that make us hesitate in that matter.

We acknowledge, that tho' some have scrupled to call the Scriptures the *Word of God*, yet some of our Friends have called their Counsels given in Writing, *The Word of the Lord*. The *Word of God* is properly, in the New Testament, predicated of the Eternal Son of God: To predicate the same Terms of the Scriptures, that we do of the Son of God, may induce ignorant Persons, from the Identity of Words, to conclude, that the Scriptures are the only Word of God. From such Reasonings, I am apt to think, sprung those Blasphemous Expressions of certain *Priests* in the *North*, mentioned by *G. Fox* in his *Great Mystery*, who affirmed, That the ** Scripture is God*, † *the Sword of the Spirit*, * *the Power of God*, &c. To obviate such abominable Positions for the future, our Friends have been obliged to oppose the calling the Scriptures the *Word of God*, by telling People, that *Christ* was the *Word of God*; and that the *Scriptures* were the *Words*, and not properly the *Word of God*.

* P. 261.

† P. 247.

* P. 280.

From our calling any Writings the **Word of the Lord**, this Mistake cannot arise; because Christ is no where called the *Word of the Lord*; and those Messages, which the Prophets, &c. instrumentally delivered to the *House of Israel*, by a special Afflatus, are in sacred Writ commonly called the *Word of the Lord*: Therefore we do not oppose the calling those Divine Messages, which some now-a-days have been commanded, by the same Spirit the Prophets formerly had, to communicate to his People, the **Word of the Lord**.

They are so far from allowing this Name (*Word* P.93.94. of the Lord) to the sacred Writings, that they have in several of their Books called them the *Dead Letter*, *Dust*, and *Death*, and *Serpent's Meat*, and other such Vile and Reproachful Names: Hear G. Fox, in his *News out of the North*, p. 14. "Your Original is Carnal, Hebrew, Greek and Latin; and your Word is Carnal, the Letter; and the Light is Carnal, the Letter: So Dust is the Serpent's Meat, their Original is but Dust, which is but the Letter, which is Death; and their Gospel is but Dust, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, which is the Letter.

Who those They are, that will not allow the Name of *Word*, or *Words of the Lord*, to the holy Scriptures, I know not; if the Pronoun They, respects the *Quakers*, let him nominate the Persons; for I never heard of any such amongst us.

The Passage taken out of *G. Fox's News out of the North*, being printed without any *Breaks*, or other Marks, which are generally used by Men of Candor; to inform their Readers, that some

some Words are omitted in the Citation: Most would be subject to believe, that the Words in the Original follow one another, as the *Rector* hath placed them here; to demonstrate the contrary, and to shew how unlike a fair Disputant his proceedings are, I shall take the trouble to cite them anew. *Your Teacher is Carnal, and by the Will of Man; and your Original is Carnal, Hebrew, Greek and Latin; and your Word is Carnal, the Letter; and the Light is Carnal, the Letter.* Twelve Lines under this Passage, in which space are two other Subjects treated on, he continues, *So Dust is the Serpent's Meat, their Original is but Dust, which is but the Letter, which is Death; their Church is Dust, a heap of Lime and Stones gather'd together; so the Serpent feeds upon Dust: And all this is in the first Birth; and the Carnal Mind cannot please God, which feeds upon all these Carnal Things. And their Gospel is Dust, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which is the Letter; and all this is in the Carnal Mind, feeding it, which is the Enemy against God, which is without God, in the Generation of Cain, and the Wicked, whose Prayers are an Abomination, and whose Sacrifices God hath no respect to.*

To have a right understanding of this Passage, it will be convenient to consider, who it is our Friend here speaks to, and what is the Antecedent to the Pronoun *You*. In the preceding part of this Paragraph are these, *Enemies of God, Adversaries of Righteousness, Workers of Iniquity, Blind Guides, Dissembling Hypocrites, &c.* Is not the Original of such a Ministry, as is here described, Carnal? What Measure can these be supposed to have of the Spirit?

Spirit? Are not many Ministers now-a-days under the same Predicament? What have they more than the Languages? Is not a competent Knowledge of *Latin, Greek and Hebrew*, accounted a sufficient Qualification for the Ministry? Cannot the Carnal Man, by his Natural Powers, arrive at these Qualifications? Why then should *G. F.* be blamed for saying, *Your Original* (speaking of wicked Ministers) *is Carnal*? Are not their Words carnal? Is not their Light darkness? Is there any thing Spiritual, that can be attributed to them? Who are in the first Birth, slaying and persecuting the Righteous? 'Twas against such as these, this whole Section was levelled, as by the Contents is undeniable.

It is here said, *Your Word is Carnal, the Letter; and the Light is Carnal, the Letter.* What the Author intends by *Letter*, has a difficulty in it. Some, I am sensible, do affirm, that it relates to the Scriptures; but that is a *Petitia Principii*, or begging of the Question, and no ways deducible from the foregoing Words; therefore I admit it not. *Letter*, properly signifies any Character used in Writing or Printing; improperly, the Doctrine of *Moses*, and *Jesus Christ*, without his Spirit or inward Grace. In this Sense 'tis used by *Paul*, *Who also hath made us able Ministers of the New Testament; not of the Letter, but of the Spirit; for the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.* When our friend said, *Your Word is Carnal, the Letter; and the Light is Carnal, the Letter*; I am persuaded, he took *Letter* in the same sense the Apostle did: Then his Meaning is, in Words
and

1 Cor. 3. 6

and outward Observations you make a Shew of Christianity; but you want the Life and Power of a real Christian; you make an outward Confession to the Light of Christ, but you are not guided by it: This may be said, without any Breach of Charity, of such as he there directed his Discourse unto.

Immediately after *The Light is Carnal, the Letter*, my Adversary joyns, *So Dust is the Serpent's Meat*; whereas in that Page, there are Twelve Lines between, *The Light is Carnal, the Letter*; and, *so Dust is the Serpent's Meat*. In this intermediate space, G. F. treats on *Infants Baptism* and the *Supper*; from these two Subjects coming between these Propositions, I conclude, no Man, that understands the nature of a Proposition, will say, that *So Dust is the Serpent's Meat*, is predicated of the *Letter*; consequentially no ways respects the *Scriptures*.

Their (Enemies of God, Adversaries of Righteousness, &c.) *Original is but Dust, which is but the Letter, which is Death*.

What is the Wicked Ministers Original but Dust? What hath he but the Cortical Part of Religion? Are not all Letters and Characters corruptible, consequentially Dust? Doth not ^{2 Cor. 3.} the Apostle say, *The Letter killeth*? What difference is there between saying, *The Letter killeth*, or *The Letter is Death*; that is, causeth *Death*? He that carpeth at such an Expression, as this is, may do the like by *Paul*, for saying, *The Letter killeth*; The Sense is the same, tho' worded differently.

Four Lines under the former Passage, our Friend goes on, *And their Gospel is but Dust*,
Matthew,

Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which is the Letter. Some of the Antecedents, which Their relates to, are *Workers of Iniquity, Blind Guides, Dissembling Hypocrites, who blaspheme the worthy Name of the Lord, &c.* What is there in these Mens Gospel, that may not be termed *Dust*? What is the outward History to such, more than another? To the Natural Man, it is a Sealed Book. That the divine Spirit is necessary (J. S. says) to assist our sincere endeavours, for the right understanding the Sacred Writings: Hence I infer, the unrighteous Man hath no right understanding of the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The Writings of the Evangelists may be considered *Materialiter*, or *Formaliter*; Materially, as they consist of Ink, Paper, &c. without any Contempt of the Authors, or Matters therein related, they may be called *Dust*; Formally, as they declare the Everlasting Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, We esteem them as Inestimable Jewels: But that the Letter, the τὸ γράμμα, the *litera Scripta*, is Corruptible, is *Dust*, we dare not deny. These Matters being in a just Ballance weighed, I desire J. S. to produce one fair Quotation, where any of our Friends have vilified, in *terminis*, the holy Scriptures, or have dropp'd any Expression concerning them, which may not be truly predicated of them, either in a Material or Formal Sense.

The following words are annexed to the former, *These seem to the Worlds People, to be* P. 94. *very scandalous Expressions, spoken in down-right Contempt of the holy Scriptures.*

If the World's People will take words in a Sense different from the Speakers intent and purpose, if they will be imposed on by the malicious Partiality of their Teachers Citations or if they will consider Words indefinitely which are restricted to particulars, they may thank their own Ignorance, Credulity, or Partiality ; if they entertain false Notions of us let them but attentively read our Writings and justly weigh the Drift and Intent of the Authors, then they will find, in none of them any scandalous Expressions, spoken in down-right Contempt of the holy Scriptures.

P. 94. *Being asked, (i. e. G. Whitehead) Whether any Body ever said, that the Ink and Paper were not Dust? George smartly replies here, He, i. e. the Author of the Snake, yields the point; he grants, saith he, the Ink and the Paper to be Dust. What then? Was this ever a Point in dispute? Was there ever any Debate about Ink and Paper? No, Whitehead knows in his Conscience, that this is only a senseless Shuffle, to cover and hide the great Apostles horrid and shameful Contempt of the Scriptures.*

Whether there was ever any Body so stupid as *in terminis*, to deny, that Paper and Ink were Dust, I know not; but this I am satisfied in that there have been several that have taken a Bible in their hands, and said, *This is the Word of God*, meaning the Bible which they held in their hands: To which our Friends have replied, That which is in thy hand is Paper and Ink; the Word of God is Spiritual; but the Book in thy hand is Material; the Word of God is Incorruptible, but that Book is Corruptible

ruptible; and what is Corruptible will return to Dust; consequentially 'tis not the Word of God, which is Eternal.

To say, that the *Bible*, which is made of Paper and Ink, is the Word of God; or to say, that Paper and Ink is the Word of God, to us are equivalent Propositions. For any to say, that the Scriptures, which are Paper and Ink, are the Word of God, and to grant, that the Word of God is Eternal; some may very rationally from such Premises conclude, that such a Man's Opinion is, that Paper and Ink is not Dust.

To his Query, *Was there ever any Debate about Paper and Ink?* I reply in the Affirmative: As a Witness for me, take *G. Fox's* own words.

"The Scriptures, which signifie Writings, as you (Priests) say: Outward Writings, Paper and Ink, is not Infallible, nor is not Divine; but is Humane, and a Humane Knowledge from it Men get: And so Writings, Paper and Ink, that is not Infallible.—You that put the Letter for the Ground of your Faith, your Rule; **Paper and Ink**, that will come to **Dust**. And to *Francis Higginson's* objecting,

that to say, *The Letter of the Scripture is Carnal*, is an Error: *G. F.* replies, "The Letter written in Paper and Ink; now Paper and Ink is not Spiritual, but that which it speaks of is Spiritual. Here he distinguishes, as *G. W.* doth, between the Materiality and Formality of the Scriptures, and predicates *Dust* only of the Paper and Ink. Hence the *Rector's* Ignorance or Malice is apparent, from his saying, That this distinction of *G. W.* is only a senseless

*Great
Mystery*
p. 302.

p. 62.

Shuffle, to cover and hide their great Apostles horrid and shameful Contempt of the holy Scriptures.

P. 94.

The Discovery of the great Enmity of the Serpent;
P. 17.

The Rector proceeds, *But what think they of Friend Dewsbury, The dead Letter, says he, which Man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel, and had deceived me: Now what's this that had deceived him, the Ink and Paper? No, no; these guilty Excuses will not do; it's plain he meant the Doctrine and the Precepts of the Gospel.*

To his Query, *But what think they of Friend Dewsbury?* My answer is, I think he was a faithful Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that the Lord was with him, and supported him in his manifold Sufferings, Travels, Labours and Exercises; and that he was instrumental in the hand of the Lord, to the turning of many to his blessed Truth: But that he disrespected the Scriptures, or spoke contemptibly of the Gospel, I deny. As to the Passage cited by my Opponent, 'tis partially done, and his Sense is grossly misrepresented.

To give the Reader a genuine Idea of the Author's meaning, I shall add the preceding and subsequent words: "Then I could no longer fight with a Carnal Weapon, against a Carnal Man, for the Dead Letter, which Man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel, and had deceived me; but then the Lord discovered to me the Deceits of all these Men in England, that were seeking the Kingdom of Heaven in outward Observations. Should I consider the Materiality of this Sentence, Which Man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel, and had deceived me, it will appear to be a Copulative Proposition; such Propo-

sitions

sitions have two Subjects, and as many Predicates; the latter are always Verbally expressed, but this doth not always happen to the former: When the Subject is not expressed, that which was the Subject of the first, is accounted the Subject of the latter Proposition. Let us supply that defect here, and see how it will read, *Which Man called the Gospel, and which Man had deceived me*: Hence I conclude, that *had deceived me*, is not to be attributed to the *Gospel*, but to *Man*. If any shall ignorantly conclude the contrary, let him consider, that *Gospel* is the Accusative Case, of the Object in the first part of the Proposition; then let him give me an Instance, if he can, where the Accusative Case of the Object, in the first part of a Copulative Proposition, is the Nominative Case to the Verb in the latter; till that is done, I shall adhere to this Opinion.

These things premised, the literal Sense of this Passage is, That *W. D.* having been encouraged by some to fight for the *Bible*, after he was convinced, that the Gospel of our Lord did not consist only in *Words*, but also in *Power*, he could no longer fight with a Carnal Weapon, against a Carnal Man, for the dead Letter, which Man in his Carnal Wisdom called the *Gospel*; and by calling the dead Letter the *Gospel*, had deceived him: Then were the Deceits of these Men (who are we to understand by *these Men*? Why such as had deceived him, by calling the dead Letter the *Gospel*, and such as were seeking the Kingdom of Heaven only in outward Observations) discovered to him. Now I appeal to any Man, not tinctured with

P. 94. Prejudice of the deepest dye, whether J. S. is not extreamly Ignorant of common Learning, or Superlatively Malicious, in inferring from the preceding Premises, *Here you see the Quakers Spirit appears with his Cloven-Foot; for this is, in plain English, to tell us, That the holy Jesus, and his blessed Apostles, were Deceivers?* Was I on a Jury, and such a Matter came before me to be decided, I should conclude, that the Plaintiff did not understand plain English.

If any imagine, that we use the term, *dead Letter*, in contempt of the Doctrines in the Scriptures, they are grossly mistaken; our drift is, by it to let People know, that we make a difference, which many do not, between the Writing, the Book, the Letter; and the Faith, Word, and Doctrine declared in it. The Light, the Spirit of God, and Christ within, nigh, in the Heart, to which Paul directed his Followers by his Ministry, we call the *Gospel*: But that the *γραφη*, the *ἰδὲ γράμμα*, the Writing, the Letter, the Characters, which, as so many Hieroglyphicks represent divers Objects, according as they are variously ranged, are dead, senseless, lifeless, and inanimate Beings, we shall never deny.

After having spent a Page or two in painting this Passage, in the ugliest Colours enraged Malice could invent, his Heat carries him on thus, P. 96. *By Belshing out the above-mentioned Blasphemy: For the dead Letter, says this Wretch, which Man in his Carnal Wisdom called the Gospel, and had deceived me: These are his very words, and if this be not rank wild Blasphemy, I desire*

the Friends to tell me what is. By the Air of this Period, one would be apt to think, that John's Blood was all on the fret, when he penned it. He is not backward in censuring others for their *scolding Civilities, and letting their Passion* P. 115. *boyl over, and spend it self in Rage and Malice against their Adversaries.* How exactly doth this Man describe himself here! He can see the Mote in his Brother's Eye, but how imperceptible is the Beam in his own! He can blame others for giving hard Words, yet how abundantly do his own Writings overflow with them!

To his Query, *If this be not rank wild Blasphemy, I desire the Friends to tell me what is?* My answer is, That I do not conceive, that there is any thing like Blasphemy in our Friends Writings. To gratifie his desire, I shall take liberty to inform him, That my opinion is, tho' none of our Society are, yet many of his Brethren are annually guilty of rank wild Blasphemy, in comparing the Indignities and Sufferings of King Charles the First, with those of Jesus Christ; nay, some have not stopp'd here, but after a running on in a blasphemous parallel, have said, That his were equal to, if not exceeded those of our Saviour.

Let me illustrate this matter by another Proposition of the same Species, that the Ignorance of those (who make the Accusative Case in the first part, the Nominative Case to the Verb in the latter) may the more obviously appear: Suppose, I say,

A Rector doth not understand a Copulative Proposition, and hath deceived me.

Is, and hath deceived me, to be predicated of the *Copulative Proposition*, or of the *Rector*? Certainly all Men of Judgment will say of the latter, and not of the former. But according to J. S.'s new way of Reasoning, this Instance must be read thus: A *Rector* doth not understand a *Copulative Proposition*, and a *Copulative Proposition* hath deceived me. Hence it appears, that these Modes of Expounding such kind of Propositions will unavoidably run Men into innumerable Absurdities; for which Reason, I shall wave this Subject; conceiving, what is already said, may be sufficient to expose the Ignorance of the Original, and deter others from imitating him therein.

P. 98. I am very sensible, that the Quakers have, in some of their late Writings, given the Scriptures very good Words, and have pretended, that they do believe them to be of Divine Authority, as being given by the Inspiration of God: Yes, and that they prefer them to all other Books extant in the World.

We have not only in our late, but also in our former Writings, given the Scriptures good Words, and made them the *Standard of our Doctrines*. If any Person will read those very Books, cited by my Opponent to prove us Contemners of them, he will find no Writings fuller of Quotations out of them, than those are: Is it then probable, that what we have admitted to be the Test of our Principles, and hourly cite to prove our Tenets, should be despised by us? Certainly no Man, not tinctured with the blackest Malice, will, after

after a serious Reading of our ancient Writings, and hearing of our publick Testimonies, which are so plentifully sprinkled with Texts of Scripture, conclude, that we do, in the least degree, undervalue them. Had we not had a high esteem of them, can it be supposed, that we would have been at the trouble, to fill our Writings with so many Passages out of them.

And we do now, as we have reiteratedly done, declare, That we believe these sacred Monuments to be of divine Authority, and given by the Inspiration of the Almighty; and on that account prefer them before all Books extant in the World.

He goes on, *What are Death and Dust—* p. 98. proper Titles for Books wrote by divine Inspiration?

Yes, when the Author explains his Terms, and distinguishes between the Materiality and Formality of a Book; between the Case, and the Jewel contained in it; between the Letter, and the Doctrines, &c. represented by it; especially when his Opponent confounds these things together.

In their Yearly Meeting, held at London, 1675. p. 98. it was ordered, That no such slight and contemptible Names and Expressions, as, that faithful Friends Papers are Mens Edicts or Canons, with such scornful Sayings, be permitted.

To give the true Sense of our Friend's words, Necessity compelled me, in some preceding Pages, to expose my Opponent's Partiality in Citation; so common Justice to the absent, has obliged me here to do the like. How unlike a Christian

Christian Advocate his Proceedings against us are, from this Passage quoted at length, will more fully appear: The Paragraph, where the fore-mentioned words are, begins; "It is our
 " Sense, Admonition and Judgement, in the
 " fear of God, and the Authority of his Power
 " and Spirit, to Friends and Brethren in their
 " several Meetings, *that no such slight and contemptible Names and Expressions*, as calling Mens
 " or Womens Meetings, Courts, Sessions, or
 " Synods, that they are Popish Impositions,
 " useless and burdensome; *that faithful Friends*
 " *Papers* (which we testifie have been given
 " forth from the Spirit and Power of God)
 " *are Mens Edicts or Canons*, or embracing
 " them, bowing to Man. Elders in the Service of the Church, *Popes or Bishops*, with
 " *such scornful Sayings*, be permitted amongst
 " them, &c. What Credit is to be given to a Man, that boggles not to make the Predicate of one Proposition the Predicate of another, and the Subject of one Proposition the Subject of another?

Who will justify the calling of those Papers, which have been given forth from the *Spirit and Power of God*, Mens Edicts or Canons? The Penners of these Lines, did not in this place oppose the calling of *Friends Papers*, *Mens Edicts or Canons* indefinitely, but restricted it here to those Papers, that were dictated by the *Holy Spirit*.

Such scornful Sayings, is not predicated of *Mens Edicts and Canons*, as the Rector doth but of *Popes and Bishops*; as any Man, that hath a grain of Sense, or that understands the

Nature

Nature of a Proposition, must acknowledge.

Note, This Paragraph was levelled against some Apostates, who, contemning our good Orders, made use of such terms, on purpose to render our Discipline the more Contemptible in the Eyes of others.

Wyeth tells us, that such Names and Expressions *do strike at the Spirit and Power of God:—And do not they imagine, that slight and contemptible Names will, by the same Reason, strike at the Spirit and Power of God, by which the holy Scriptures were given forth?* p. 98.
Switch,
p. 164.

Our Sentiments do concur with J. Wyeth, in believing, that some Names and Expressions *do strike at the Spirit and Power of God*: But that our Friends have used any slight or contemptible Names, concerning the Doctrines, Institutions, &c. contained in holy Writ, is yet to be proved. The Names and Expressions, which our Adversaries have commented upon in our Books, were not spoken in any contempt of, or disrespect to the things related in these Writings; but to admonish, and bring those that had, in a degree, Deified the Letter, to a right Sense and Spiritual Knowledge of the things testified of in the Scriptures.

The last Instance I shall at present take notice of to you, of the Quakers Contempt of the holy Scriptures, is their neglecting to read them in their Meetings. p. 99.

The Invalidity of my Opponent's two former Instances of our Contempt of the holy Scriptures, I have already shewn: To the Consideration of his last, I shall now proceed, which is deduced from our not Reading them in our publick

publick Meetings. It's true, our method is not to read them in our Assemblies, which are constituted for another purpose; but as long as we daily read them in our private Houses, learn them by Heart, and continually sprinkle our publick Testimonies with various Passages out of them, we cannot justly be accounted as Contemners of 'em. Is he that locks up his Master's Sayings in his Heart, or he that imprisons them in his Closet, and rarely views them, but when 'tis for his secular Advantage, the greatest Esteemer of them? Let the impartial judge.

P. 99,
300.

If they have such a mighty regard for them, they would fain make ignorant People believe; pray ask them, why they have banished the Scriptures out of their Meetings?

We pay the same respect to these sacred Writings, that our Neighbours do; we pretend not to have a greater regard for them than we really have; we never banished 'em out of our Meetings. By *Scriptures*, J. S. means either the *Doctrines*, &c. contained in them, or the *Bible*, that contains 'em: As to the first, our Ministers weekly inculcate, and recommend them to their Followers to be observed; and to the last, G. Fox gave a Folio Bible to the Meeting-house in London, where it remains to this day. Hence it is evident, that we are grossly traduced, when represented as a Society that, through disrespect, banishes the Scriptures out of our Assemblies.

P. 100.

The Church of God has in all Ages read his Word when they met for Religious Worship, as God himself has positively commanded.

Where

Where has God positively commanded his Word, i. e. the Scriptures to be Read by his People, when they assemble to Worship him *Apostolically*? I have met with no Canon in my Bible, which enjoys us, *Christians*, to read the Writings of the *Prophets, Apostles, &c.* in our Meetings. When J. S. has as Substantially proved this Assertion, as Dogmatically affirmed it, he needs not doubt of making me his Profelyte, and my Friends also.

It's now about Fifty Years since *Quakerism* first P. 100 appeared in England, and indeed in the World; and yet in all this time, the *Quaker-Leaders* have never given any Orders for the publick Reading of the holy Scriptures, although they have frequently commanded and encouraged their own *Epistles* to be read in their Assemblies.

As long as the Doctrines of our Faith are as ancient as Christianity it self, and such as the Primitive Christians professed, we are not concerned at the late Date of the term *Quakerism*; it was a Name at first given us in scorn by our Enemies; how long they will continue to doth not at present distract our Thoughts.

We acknowledge, that our Leaders, as a Society of People, never gave any Orders for the publick Reading of the holy Scriptures in our Meetings for Worship, nor of any other Book. Some Particulars, on certain Occasions, have recommended their *Epistles* to be read in our Meetings; but whether it was repeatedly observed, or no, I am ignorant. What Singulars may desire, without the Approbation of the rest, we never esteemed it as a Rule for the rest to walk by. That our Leaders have frequently

frequently commanded the Reading of their own Epistles in our Meetings, without a better proof than an *Ipse dixit*, I shall not admit; nay, I desire J. S. to nominate one of our Friends, that ever commanded the frequent Reading of his Epistle in our Assemblies. Our Meetings are constituted and ordained to worship God in Silence, by abstracting our Thoughts from all outward Objects, and adhering to Him alone, till He shall be pleased to Reveal his Pleasure to us; when any have received a Divine Impulse, he may deliver his Message; otherwise all are to be in Silence: Because Reading is not absolutely necessary to the Spiritual Worship of Christ. We do not, in the time of Worship, Encourage it in any; much less *Command* it. Should we give order for the frequent Reading of any Book in our Meetings, it would be for the Reading of the holy Scriptures; because we do really prefer them before *all Books extant in the World*. These Premises candidly weighed, I am apt to believe, the Unprejudiced will not pass Sentence on us, as Undervaluers of the holy Scriptures.

P. 101. **Burroughs**, who has blasphemously affirmed that the **Sufferings** of the Quakers were more Unjust, than the **Sufferings** of Christ, or his Apostles, &c.

This Passage is printed in a different Character, as if it contained the very Terms of E. B. But upon Examination of the Original to which the Book cited in the Margin refers the contrary appears: His words are, *It plainly appears, that the Suffering of the People of God*

in this Age, is a greater Suffering, and more unjust, than in the Days of Christ, or of his Apostles, &c. Before I proceed, it may be convenient to explain some Terms in this Period.

People of God, is a general Term, including all *Christians*, whether *Quakers* or others, that sincerely worship their Creator, and obey his Commands; as, *There remaineth therefore a Rest* Heb. 4. 9. *to the People of God.*

Age, is taken for a long tract of Time, viz. Seventy, or One Hundred Years; so that the *Suffering of the People of God in this Age*, may very naturally include the Suffering of all the Righteous, that suffered in the last Century, viz. those that suffered in *Piedmont, France, England, Ireland, &c.* Whose Sufferings, collectively considered, I am satisfied, are not to be paralleled in History.

In the Days of Christ, the time that he dwelt here on Earth is naturally comprehended, and is called in Scripture, *The Days of his Flesh.* Heb. 5. 7
Note, Our Friend did not say, that the Suffering of the People of God in this Age, is a greater Suffering, and more unjust, than the *Sufferings of Christ and his Apostles*; but, *than the Sufferings in the Days of Christ, or of his Apostles.* There is a great difference between the Sufferings of a Just Man, and the Sufferings that happen'd in his Days; as, the Sufferings of King James the Second, is one thing; and the Sufferings of the People in the *West*, who Suffered in his Days, in his Reign, or under his Government, is another. The Sufferings of the *People of God* in the Days of Christ, include

include the Sufferings which happen'd to the Righteous, during that space of time he tabernacled amongst us: But that it includes the Sufferings which our Saviour underwent at the hour of his Death, is easier said than proved. Those that assert it, let them produce one Instance, if they can, where it is said, Such a thing was done in the days of such a Man, and the Circumstances that attended him as he was a dying, are by such Modes of Speech naturally included.

After our Friend had, in general, spoken of the Sufferings of the People of God in former Ages, he goes on, and particularly shews; That the Persecutors, *anno 1657.* were more culpable than their Predecessors: Because the *Jews* pretended a Law for what they did to the Primitive Christians; and the *Papists*, in Queen *Mary's* days, proceeded against the *Protestants* according to their unjust Laws. But the Rulers in 1657. used a Despotick Power, and arbitrarily condemned our Friends, without any Shadow of a Law, only for using the plain Language, not pulling off their Hats, &c. Nay, their proceedings against them, were sometimes Diametrically opposite to *Magna Charta*. Herein their greater Injustice appeared.

Would not a Man of Candor have considered the Words of the Dead, in the most favourable Sense they would bear, and not have altered his Terms, and then call him a Blasphemer? Such Proceedings, doubtless, will disrelish even a Moral Palate. What greater Violence can be done the Deceased, than to paint them in a false Dress? Is there no difference between these

Terms,

Terms, *People of God*, and *Quakers*; between the *Suffering of Christ*, and the *Suffering in the Days of Christ*? Certainly there is. If they are to be accounted equivalent Expressions, why were they not exactly quoted? No, No; the *Rector* is sensible, had the Passage been fairly cited, it would not have answered his design. Were the Monuments of Antiquity to be examined I am satisfied, that such unfair Actions cannot be parallell'd in the Writings of the *Jews*, *Heathens*, or *Atheists*, which they penn'd against the Ancient and Modern Christians: If I am mistaken, let him produce one Instance thereof.

The Quakers have actually ordered their own P. 101.
Writings to be read in their Meetings, — and I challenge them to produce, out of all their Books, any such Encouragement for the Reading of the holy Scriptures.

Some Particulars, we own, have, on certain occasions, recommended their *Epistles* to be read in our publick Assemblies: But that the *Quakers*, as a Society of People, have ordered their own Writings to be read in their Meetings of Worship, wants better Testimonials, than my Adversary's solitary Affirmation, to confirm it, before 'twill be credited by such as know our Methods in the like Affairs. His *Challenge* we value not; but this I shall presume to say, that if he produces the Book and Page, where we have given a standing Order for the Reading of our Books in our Meetings, in the same may be also produced a Command for the Reading of the holy Scriptures: Let the *Rector* prove the former, and I may undertake to prove the latter.

P

What

P. 102. What do these Quakers mean then, to smooth it to the Parliament, as if they did really believe the holy Scriptures to be of Divine Authority?

When we told the Parliament, that we believed the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of Divine Authority, as being given by the Inspiration of the Almighty, we spoke our real Sentiments, and considered our Words in that Sense, which at the first Hearing or Reading of them, is obvious to every Man of common Sense.

The Conclusion Answered.

P. 102. MY Adversary begins his Conclusion, Thus I have endeavoured to give you (my honest Neighbours) a short account of some of the Quaker-Errors, which I told you were so utterly destructive to the Christian Religion.

The Rector's Endeavours to represent us Erroneous, by his unnatural and violent Interpretations of our Writings, from what is already said, are undeniable; and I am of opinion, that his honest Neighbours, who see with their own Eyes, and not with those of their dishonest Teacher, are sensible thereof. His Essays in this matter, are much like those of Celsus, of whom

Orig.
cont.

Cels. l. 6.

Origen bears this Testimony, ἐβελίβη τις ἀπειρας τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἐντυχόντας αὐτῇ ἢ γραφῇ, πολεμῶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς; He would fain, by his Writings, make us hated by those that are ignorant of our Principles.

His

His following words are, *I suppose none of* P. 102.
you can imagine, that I have thrust my self un-
necessarily into a Controversie with the Quakers.

May I take the liberty to publish my Thoughts on this occasion, which are, That according to my Sentiments, none of his *honest Neighbours*; who have attentively read both Sides of the late Controversies between us and our Adversaries, will imagine; but that their Minister had a great Itch to appear in Print, when he repeated those Abuses, which had been so often objected against us before, without taking more notice of the Replies given to these Threadbare Calumnies.

The World is not much obliged to him, on account of his *pretended Discoveries*; because they are so weak, so partial, and so trifling, that doubtless in the Eyes of the Judicious, they will more expose the Ignorance and Unfairness of the Discoverer, than any pretended Concealed Errors amongst us.

He proceeds, *I assure you, I am really sorry* P. 102.
that I have so just an occasion to appear
against them; it being no little surprise to me, to
see such a small Number of them erect a Large
and Spacious Meeting-house amongst
us.

The occasion of this *real Sorrow*, is either for the Errors which he imagines he hath met with in our Friends Books, or for the *Spacious Meeting-house* that is lately erected near his Habitation. For the first, I cannot conceive his Grief is; because, was he really concerned for the numerous Errors he fancies are amongst us, he would not have magnified the

Weakness of some, who have not been so cautious in wording their Discourses; nor have drawn their Imperfections in worse Colours, than they are already cloathed with, by his Curtailing our Sayings, by his dropping Explanatory Terms in the middle of Periods, and by making the Subject of one Predicate to be the Subject of another, and the Predicate of one Subject to be the Predicate of another: If he pretends his *real Sorrow* is on this account, his own Actions will evidently demonstrate the contrary. For can it be supposed, that any Man is *really Sorrowful* for the Wounds his Countryman hath received, when he applies Remedies, whose Nature is rather to dilate than heal them? This *Sorrow* and *Surprise*, more probably, is for the building of a *Meeting-house* in his Neighbourhood; because, if this should have the dreaded Effect, 'tis not unlikely, but he will now and then lose a *Fleece*; which, no doubt, will be more afflicting to him, than the loss of a *Sheep*.

P. 103. *I thought it very proper to lay before you, in these Papers, some of their Pernicious Principles; which, if attentively Read, and impartially Considered, I doubt not, will, in some measure, by God's assistance, not only arm you against their most dangerous Opinions, but will also confirm you in the Christian Faith.*

It is a difficulty we have long lain under, that our Enemies, and not our selves, must be accounted the right Expositors of our Writings, and of our Belief. Were these Principles, which the Rector calls here *Pernicious*, *attentively Read, impartially Considered* with their Context, and

and justly squared by the Author's own words, in some other part of his Writings, where he professedly treats on the same Subject, I doubt not but they will, with Divine Assistance, appear to be no dangerous Opinions, but such as the Scriptures warrant, and many of the Ancient Christians maintained.

Let me desire you to take the Bible into your P. 103.
hands, and mind how our Saviour has cautioned
his Followers, not to be gulled and deceived by
such false Teachers, that shall come to them in Mat. 7.
Sheeps Cloathing; that is, with soft and smooth 15.
Pretences.

Let me, in like manner, intreat all, who desire the Welfare of their never-dying Souls, to take their Bibles into their hands, diligently read, seriously consider the holy Doctrines recorded, and unbyassedly observe the Lives and Actions of the first Publishers of those sacred Writings, and follow those, whose steps are the most consentaneous to those of the first Dispensators of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and mind how our Saviour has cautioned his Followers, not to be gull'd and deceiv'd by false Teachers, who shall come to them in Sheeps Cloathing, but inwardly are Ravening Wolves; rending the Flock, if they will not easily part with their Fleeces; and are more sollicitous in taking away the Cloathing of the Sheep, than in preserving the Sheep themselves.

We are not only Fore-warned, but Commanded P. 104.
to avoid those that cause Divisions among Chri-
stians; how much more careful then ought we to Rom. 16.
be, not to run to the Meetings of those, who are 17, 18.
the professed and open Enemies of our Religion?

You do not find the Friends so complaisant to go with you to serve God in our Churches.

Rom. 16.
17, 18.

We are exhorted by the Apostle, in the Text cited by the Rector, to *mark them that cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrines which they have learned, and to avoid them.* He subjoins the Reason, *For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly.* Is not John Stillingfleet one of those, here pointed at by Paul? Doth not he endeavour to cause Divisions between the Queen's Peaceable Subjects, by his many Misrepresentations? Do not his numerous Untruths, sprinkled throughout his Book, offend the sincere Christian's Ear? Are not such Proceedings contrary to the Doctrines which our Saviour taught his Disciples, who said, *As ye would that Men should do to you, do ye also to them; Love thy Neighbour as thy self; Do violence to no Man?* Is not this Man's drift and design, a reverse to these divine Precepts? And doth not he, by abusing us, intentionally serve his own Belly; that is, expect some Ecclesiastical Preferments for his Extraordinary Performances?

Luke 6.
31.
Mark 12.
31.
Luke 3.
14.

There seems to be a concern on my Adversary, by reason some of his Neighbours go to our *Meetings*; would he for the future prevent it, he should retract what he has published to our disadvantage: For as long as he goes on clamouring against us, as *Blasphemers*, &c. no doubt but he will excite a Curiosity in all, who pin not their Faith on their Minister's Sleeve, to go and see and hear for themselves. This Motive, probably, has induced Thousands, which otherwise might not have had such

such early Inclinations to come to our Assemblies.

Had our Friends the liberty to walk into their Houses of Worship, without taking off our Hats, or seeing any Idolatrous Actions, &c. as they may come into ours, probably many would go there. Neither have we ever treated them in our Religious Assemblies, as they have us in theirs, by abusing and confining our Persons.

Why should any, who acknowledge themselves P. 104.
Members of this Church, be so soft and easie, as to hearken and yield to the Quakers Solicitations?

Those who have heard abusive Reports concerning any Neighbour or Acquaintance, should, before they entertain any Prejudices against him on that score, be well informed of the Truth of such Stories: But if any have been so soft and easie, as to harbour disadvantageous Thoughts concerning this Man, or that Society of People, solely on the Credit of another; they should, if they would be just, as soon as they are acquainted, that they have been imposed on, take due care to be better informed; that is, go to the Person, or to the Meetings of those they have heard *hard things of*, to satisfy themselves whether they have been mis-informed, or no. On this account, all who believe us to be so Heterodox, as our Enemies say we are, should (seeing we deny their Allegations) before they pass Sentence on us, go to our Meetings (especially when solicited) to see whether we are such Infidels, as represented; and not condemn us

Ex. 23.1.
Ps. 15.3.

merly on Hear-says, without going to our Assemblies, to hear for themselves, when they are in their Neighbourhood. God commanded the Israelites, *Not to raise* (or, as the Marginal Reading hath it, *receive*) *a false Report*; much less industriously to spread it. I hope none of my Adversary's *honest Neighbours* are Transgressors of this divine Precept.

The Reason is obvious, why those who credit the black Charges objected against us by prejudiced Persons, should hearken and yield to our Solicitations, when we desire them to go to our Meetings: Because, were they morally Just, or good Christians, they would not condemn us *ex parte*; but would do like the *Noble Bereans*, who daily searched the Scriptures, to inform themselves whether the things related by *Paul* concerning the *Messias*, were as he represented them: Would the Prejudiced do the like by us, we should commend their Inquisitiveness. It is no surprise to find *J. S.* cautioning his Neighbours against their going to our *Meetings*; because, should they do it, no doubt but they would see, that we are much abused, and abominate him for thus traducing us.

P. 104.

To the Rector's Query, *What can you propose to your selves, by going amongst the Quakers?*

I reply: To inform themselves, whether we hold such *damnable Doctrines*, as we are represented to maintain; and whether we do not teach, and press home to the Consciences of Men, the Doctrines of the Christian Religion, and that more emphatically, than any other Christian Societies do; and whether they are

not

not more benefitted by our living Declarations, than by the dead Harrangues of their own Ministers?

If you once come to be Fox's Disciples, you must Renounce your Christian Baptism; and by Embracing Quakerism, must throw off Christianity. P. 105.

Which of *George Fox's* Disciples hath been obliged to Renounce his *Christian Baptism*? I provoke *J. S.* to tell me. Let him prove this Untruth, or own himself a *Calumniator*. What *Christianity* is it, that those who embrace what he calls *Quakerism*, must renounce? If he says, 'tis that contained in the *New Testament*, we deny it; but if he only means those *Ceremonies*, introduced in the great Night of Apostacy, and accounted by some as *Essentials* of Christianity, we do not only oppose, but plead for the throwing them off.

He annexes, *For those who believe, as the Quakers do, only in the Light within, are those miserable Hereticks, foretold of by the Apostle, who brought in Damnable Doctrines, denying the Lord who bought them.* P. 105. 2Pet. 2.1

How shall we be certain, that the *miserable Hereticks*, foretold of by *Peter*, are such as believe only in the *Light within*? Is the *Rector's* Assertion a sufficient Authority? If we will not take his Word, I do not perceive, that we shall be favoured with a more substantial Proof.

Notwithstanding the Confidence of my Adversary in this place, give me leave to offer my Reasons, why I subscribe not to his Opinion:

I. Be-

1. Because 'tis generally believed, that the Apostle here spake of some *Heresies* then extant among the Christians. 2. That the Teachers, that should bring in *damnable Heresies*, were the *Gnosticks*, who accounted it an indifferent thing to deny Christ, and to Forswear him in the time of Persecution: These, very properly, may be said to *deny the Lord who bought them*. 3. They were to bring in *damnable Heresies*: Now those (if there be any such) that believe only in the *Light within*, they cannot be those pointed at by the Apostle in that Text; because they, that believe only in the *Light within*, cannot be said to bring in *Heresies*, in the Plural; but only an *Heresie*, as our Adversary will have it, in the Singular Number. If there are any such *Hereticks*, as believe only in the *Light within*, now-a-days, they are perfect Strangers to me; for I know none, that say, they believe only in the *Light within*: Nevertheless, our believing in Jesus Christ, as he is the Light within us, is no denial of Christ, as he is the *Lord that bought us*, and exists without us also.

P. 106. *I easily grant, that the Quakers have of late vamped up their Religion in a new Dress, and have drawn it in livelier Colours, than formerly, that it may appear to be Christian.*

We are not sensible, that we have altered any one Principle of our Faith, since we were a People; but are the same in every respect, that we were Fifty Years ago: 'Tis possible some Expressions, which our Adversaries have carped at, are more fully explained; and some

some Doctrines of our Faith, which were only transiently treated on, are, since we have been accused of denying them, more amply expounded. But in what we are now more Orthodox, than our Primitive Friends were, we are ignorant: They were sound, and so are we, in the Christian Faith.

For all those fine words, that they have given us P. 106. of their believing in Jesus Christ, &c. are only to amuse and deceive well-meaning People, and their unwary Readers.

What is this but to call us all *Hypocrites*, and to suggest, that we never speak as we think? This is a great breach of Charity. It is a difficulty, under which we have long laboured, that we, of all People under the Sun, must not be credited, when we say this or that is our faith; but our Enemies must, when they deny it. Unless the *Rector* is omniscient, how can he be certain, that *all those fine words, which we have given, of our believing in Jesus Christ, &c. are only to amuse and deceive well-meaning People?* What are all our Words, not one excepted, concerning *our belief in Jesus Christ, &c. only to amuse and deceive?* This is hard indeed, and is far easier said than proved. Did this Man contain himself within the bounds of Probability, some Bigots possibly might believe him; but seeing he is positive in those things, which are impossible for finite Man to be certain of, I hope his Sayings against us will be the less regarded.

The Quakers have a hidden meaning in their P. 106. Expressions about Christ, &c. and use Words, when they make mention of him in their Publick Testimonies,

monies, as they call them, in a quite different sense from all the Christian World: As for instance, George Whitehead tells us, "that the Divinity "and Humanity, i. e. Manhood, of Jesus Christ, "that as he is True God, and he is most "Glorious Man, &c. they, i. e. the Quakers, "do livingly Believe, and that they have often "sincerely Confessed this, in their Publick Testimonies and Writings. Now who dares question the Quakers Christianity?

As an Instance of our using Words (when we make mention of *Christ* in our *Publick Testimonies*) in a quite different Sense from the *Christian World*, *G. Whitehead's* Sayings are cited out of a printed Sheet, intituled, *Few Positions, &c.* where he asserts *the Divinity and Humanity (i. e. Manhood) of Christ Jesus, that as he is True God, and he is most Glorious Man, our Mediator and Advocate, we livingly Believe, and have often Sincerely Confessed in our Publick Testimonies and Writings.* If my Adversary's Positiveness in this matter is not a good Evidence, I perceive that we shall not at present be obliged with much more conclusive Proofs. By reason of the Rector's Dogmaticalness, I have on this Subject discoursed *G. W.* who told me, that by *Humanity, or Manhood*, in this place, he meant the *Humanity or Manhood* which our Saviour took in the Womb of the Virgin, and was crucified, dead and buried, and rose again from the Dead; the natural import of the Words imply as much: But how *J. S.* came to be so positive in the Contrary, I cannot divine.

By *Publick Testimonies*, we understand such Discourses as are orally delivered by our Ministers in our Publick Assemblies; and do, as *G. W.* has here done, distinguish them from our Writings. How that which we have written came to be cited by *J. S.* as an Instance of what we have verbally spoken in our *Publick Testimonies*, I cannot imagine: The most favourable Construction I can pass on it, is to place it to his Heedlessness, or to his Ignorance of our manner of Expressing our Thoughts.

Since we sincerely believe, that Jesus Christ is the True God, and most Glorious Man, our Mediator and Advocate; doubtless we may say with my Opponent, *Now who dares question the Quakers Christianity?*

Notwithstanding the Friends make mighty Pretences to the greatest Plainness and Sincerity; yet you must know, that they do not mean, by the Humanity or Manhood of Jesus Christ, what all Christians understand by it, viz. the Manhood which he took of our Nature in the Womb of the Virgin, into his Person: No, no; this is far from their meaning. P. 107.

From the various Senses which most words are capable of, few are secure from misinterpretations; but if our words might be interpreted by the Context, or taken in their natural Sense, even by that intended by the Author, our *Plainness* would appear equal to our *Pretences*.

In the last recited Instance, *G. W.* did mean, by *Humanity* or *Manhood*, the same, and no other *Humanity* or *Manhood*, than what Jesus Christ took of our Nature in the Womb of the Virgin;

Virgin; but whether all Christians, in a collective Sense, do understand it in this sense, I am not certain: Neither do I account it absolutely necessary for me to be positive, whether every Individual Christian understands it so, or no; it is sufficient for me, if I and my Friends do generally take it in this sense. Unless J. S. hath entred our Thoughts, and sees what is transacted there, it is surprising to me, how he came to know, that *this is far from our meaning*; seeing it is not apparent, nor demonstrable from our words.

P. 107. He continues his Discourse, *For they have strange Notions of Christ being Man, as well as God, from all Eternity; and madly dream of his having a Body before he came into the World.*

What Thoughts some may have entertained, concerning *Christ's being Man, as well as God, from all Eternity*, may be seen in the Eighth Section of *G. Keith's Way cast up*, &c. To which, for Information, I recommend the Reader, it being too long to be cited here. What Absurdity will follow the admitting Christ to have a *Spiritual Body*, when it's granted he was Man before he came into the World? And why must such be said *madly to dream of it*? Are all mad, that favour such kind of Notions? Then *G. K.* is one of them. Let the *Rector* Invalidate his Reasons in his *Way cast up* and then give him what Designation he pleases.

P. 107. It has been plainly made appear, (especially of late) that they have, in their printed Books, most notoriously Contradicted the very Fundamentals of the Christian Religion.

If by *Contradicted* here, my Adversary means, *opposed* or *denied*; I then say, that I know not of any printed Book, wherein any of our *Friends* have *opposed* or *denied* any Fundamental of the Christian Religion. When J. S. hath shewn me a Passage, and plainly made it appear, that it is contrary to a Fundamental Article of the Christian Religion; I promise to retract it.

He subjoyns, *Yet they have been so far from Retracting or Condemning any of these vile Errors, with which they have been charged from undeniable Matters of Fact, that they publickly declare, They are not changed in their Principles.* p. 107,
108.

The Rector is mistaken, in entertaining such disadvantageous Thoughts of us, as, that we are far from Retracting or Condemning any vile Error, with which we have been charged from undeniable Matters of Fact. We are so far from justifying any *Erroneous Principles* amongst us, that we do unanimously Reject and Condemn, all Error, where-ever we find it. We defend no Tenet, but what we believe is agreeable to the Doctrines contained in the Scriptures. We cannot allow certain Passages to be erroneous, which my Adversary represents as such, by giving them a Sense, which we abhor, as much as himself. Let him interpret them, as I have done, and doubtless they will then appear Sound and Orthodox, though he would fain perswade his Readers they are otherwise.

We are not sensible, that any Error hath been charged on us, from undeniable Matters of Fact; when we are convinced, that there are
any,

any, we shall readily condemn them. We Should not do Justice to our selves, should we plead *Guilty*, when we know our selves *Innocent*. It's true, we have defended what has been objected against us as *vile Errors*, in our sense, which is sound; and I dare *J. S.* to prove it *Erroneous*. We know not one Article of the *Christian Faith*, in which we are altered since we were a People; therefore blush not publickly to declare, That we are not changed in our Principles.

P. 108. *The modern Quakers are of the same mind with the Ancient Friends, and therefore are obliged to answer to God and the World for all their Blasphemies against Jesus Christ, his sacred Ordinances, and the holy Scriptures.*

We are perswaded, that our *Ancient Friends* held the same Doctrines, preached the same Gospel, that we do, and are not conscious of deviating from them in any Essential; therefore esteem our selves in Duty obliged to justify our deceased Friends, and defend them from these black Charges of *Blasphemy*, &c. where-with they have been unjustly traduced, by their and our Enemies. I challenge the *Rector*, and all his Accomplices, to produce one plain Instance of their *Blasphemies*, without any Innuendo's, when duly interpreted by the Context, either against *Jesus Christ, his sacred Ordinances, or the holy Scriptures.*

P. 108. He goes on, *They must not think to come off, by contradicting their former Testimonies.*

Give us but liberty to walk in the common Road, even in that Path which our Adversaries take in interpreting certain Passages, which seemingly

seemingly thwart others in the same Treatise; this they do, by considering what goes before, and what follows after: Grant us this favour; nay, admit us to do our Predecessors this Justice; then we shall not desire to come off by contradicting our former Testimonies; which Method, to my knowledge, we never have been guilty of.

We cannot justly be accused for exposing those Principles to the World, which you plainly see, they are resolved both to justify and defend. P. 109.

We accuse none of Injustice, that fairly state our Principles; or, expose our Words in the sense we gave them, when penned. What we complain of, is, when certain shreds of Sentences are pared off, on purpose to render the sense Heretical; or, when our words are sensed quite contrary to the visible intent and design of the Author. It's true, we are resolved, with Divine Assistance, both to justify and to defend all our Friends Sayings, that are justifiable and defensible: And that all our Ancient Writings are such, we question not, when Time and Opportunity presents, evidently to demonstrate.

I could heartily wish the well-meaning among the Quakers would be so kind to their own Souls, as impartially, without any Prejudice or Passion, to think of these matters, which I have here offered to your serious Consideration: And I doubt not, but they would then quickly Renounce and utterly Abhor these Antichristian Doctrines. P. 109.

My ardent desire is, that the Rector's un-biassed Neighbours would read our Writings, and impartially consider our Words, as we

have interpreted them, without our Enemies odious Commentaries; and I doubt not, but they would then abominate the Violence, that is done them by their Minister. I am glad to observe, that he hath so much Charity, as to suppose there are some *well-meaning People* among us; who would, when they had seriously considered these matters, renounce and abhor the fore-cited *Antichristian Doctrines*: We need not much Consideration, before we renounce most of the Opinions here objected against; because on the first reading of them, as represented by J. S. we abhor them as much as he doth himself: For they are none of our Opinions.

P. 109. *But they have no mind to view themselves in a true Glass, it being no very easie matter to perswade them to look into the Books that are wrote against them.*

We should esteem it an Happiness, could we view our selves in a true Glass of our Enemies making; did we know where to purchase it, we should, doubtless, be the Maker's best Chapmen. We have been so often nauseated with the many Forgeries, Untruths, Partial Citations, &c. which we have met with in the Writings of our Adversaries, that 'tis no just cause of surprize, if for the future we reject them, as not meriting our better imploy'd Thoughts.

P. 110. He subjoyns, *For the Leading-Men of their own Party have always endeavoured to brand those that oppose them, with such Names of Infamy and Reproach, that their implicit Followers are unaccountably prejudiced and fore-armed against every thing that can be said, in order to their Conviction.*

Those

Those that have publickly defended our Principles, have so amply shewn the Unfairness of our Opposers, that 'tis no wonder if the Christian Reader should abhor such Invidious Proceedings. Probably they never thought it any Injustice to call a Lyar, *Lyar*; a Forger, *Forger*; a Hireling, *Hireling*, &c. If they have branded any Man with such Names of Infamy and Reproach, as his Actions justly intituled him to, he has no sufficient cause of Complaint. The apparent Envy, Malice, and known Falshoods, that are so plentifully sprinkled through our Enemies Books, are no small Motives to our rejecting of them.

He continues, *They take all for Oracles, that are to be found in the Writings of their Teachers; and esteem all to be Lyes and Forgeries, that are published to discover their fatal Delusions.* P. 110.

By *Oracles*, is commonly understood, the Divine Inspirations of the Almighty: If my Opponent takes it in this sense, he is mistaken in saying, *That we take all for Oracles* (i. e. Divine Inspirations) *that are to be found in the Writings of our Teachers.* There are certain Expressions, we acknowledge, to be found in some of our Friends Writings, that we don't ascribe to divine Immediate Openings: So the Apostle Paul saith, *I command, yet not I, but the Lord*; And again, *To the rest speak I, not the Lord*, 1 Cor. 7. 10, 12. And therefore, though some Passages have been Humanely Expressed, yet in the main, especially what concern the Essentials of *Christianity*, we are perswaded they have been penned by the Movings of the Holy Spirit. A great deal of that which has been

published against us for the Discovery, as 'tis pretended, of our *fatal Delusions*, we know, are *Lyes and Forgeries* : But that all that has been published against us falls under these Predicaments, may be demonstrated to be Stories, from our admitting some things to be true, which have been objected as Errors.

P. II. *I doubt not but a great many well-meaning People have been drawn into the Snares of Quakerism, meerly by poring over and puzzling themselves with the Quaker-Pamphlets.*

Without doubt there has been a Curiosity excited in many well-meaning People, from the frequent Clamours of some of their Ministers, to read our Books ; who probably, without these Motives, would not have been so Inquisitive ; and have by these means come to the Knowledge of the *Truth*, and to a Detestation of their Leaders, for the manifold Injuries, they see they have done us ; so leaving them, have united themselves to that Holy Principle of Truth, into which the Faithful of our Society are gathered, and in which, through Grace, they are preserved.

P. III. *I doubt not, the far greater number of them do really believe Quakerism to be Christianity.*

We are obliged to the *Rector* for the Extensiveness of his Charity towards the *far greater number* of us : And this I shall take leave to say, That we do not only believe, but are certain, that the *Essentials of Christianity* are *Apostolically* taught and maintain'd by us.

P. III. *Every Body knows, that the worst Actions in the World have been done under the pretence of Conscience.*

That

That ill Actions are often cloaked with the Pretences of Conscience, we are very sensible, from the many Lyes, reiterated Calumnies, and notorious Forgeries, which have been of late published against us on that Pretence. Doth not the *Snake, Bugg, Keith*, and my present *Adversary*, act all under that Mask? Yet what things can these Men be guilty of, worser than they have pretendedly done against us, under the *specious Shew of Conscience*?

If they (Quakers) will not endeavour to inform P. III. *their Consciences aright, by reading on both sides of the Question; if they will not fairly and impartially consult our Books, as well as their own, and calmly hear and seriously consider what can be said against their Opinions, and compare and examine things with that Care and Diligence as they ought; if they will be stubborn and obstinate, and impatient of Contradiction, form their Judgments by their Passions; if Pride or Self-conceit, and contempt of Instruction, should byass or hinder them from either knowing or embracing the plain Truths of the Gospel, in any of these or the like Cases; following their Consciences will never atone for their Infidelity at the Day of Judgment.*

We use our utmost Endeavours to inform our Consciences aright, desire God's assistance therein, and read both Sides of the Question: We do, to the best of our Judgments, fairly and impartially consult our Opposers Books; 'tis the visible Injustice there done, that makes us abhor them. The more we read them, the more we detest them; because of the Clouds of Misrepresentations, and known Untruths, we meet with. Did they treat us like Men of

Candour, or common Honesty, and give our Arguments their due force, probably we should buy more of their Writings, and peruse them oftner, than our Adversary's Hearers do. 'Tis no wonder, if after we have read two or three Pages, finding as many Lyes, we should afterwards reject them, and advise others to employ their Precious Time better, than in Reading such *Legendaries*. We do calmly hear, and seriously consider what can be said against our Opinions, when it is done without Heat or Passion; and do compare and examine things with the greatest Care and Diligence, we are capable of. We are neither Stubborn nor Obstinate, nor impatient of Contradiction, when we are perswaded 'tis done in Love, and for our future Happiness. Neither do we form our Judgments by our Passions, or Interest, as is too apparently done by my Opponent: Neither doth Pride, Self-conceit, or Contempt of Instruction, any ways byass or hinder us from either knowing or embracing the *plain Truths* of the Gospel. We are so far from not knowing, or not embracing the plain Truths of the Gospel, that I challenge the *Rector* to nominate one, that we are either ignorant of, or do not undeniably embrace: Therefore, on this score, we are entirely satisfied, that no Sins of Infidelity will be objected against us by our Glorious Redeemer, at the Day of Judgment.

P. 112.

He subjoyns, *Let me then exhort and conjure you, as you love your Souls, and as you ever hope to enjoy a blessed Eternity, not to be only careful to Live well, but also to have a true and living Faith in a Crucified Jesus.*

Let

Let me, in like manner, intreat and exhort you (who are my Adversary's Neighbours, to whom this Discourse is chiefly directed) as you love your own Souls, and as you ever hope to enjoy a Blessed Eternity, not to receive a Reproach, not to abuse, misrepresent, or calumniate an Innocent People, as your Minister hath; or traduce them, as Deniers of the *Lord that bought them, who have a true and as living a Faith in a Crucified Jesus.*

Here give me leave to tell you, that their Stub- P. 112.
born Refusal of paying of Tithes proceeds from a Sordid Covetousness, and an Implacable Hatred of the Preachers of the Christian Religion, founded on the greatest Injustice.

Here is the Bottom of his rooted Envy against us; could we put into his Mouth, and feed his Covetous Appetite, we should then be accounted neither Heterodox nor Antichristian by him. But in answer to these Calumnies, give me leave to say, That our Refusal of paying *Tithes* doth not proceed from *Stubbornness*, nor from a *Sordid Covetousness*, nor from an *Implacable Hatred* of the Preachers of the Christian Religion, but from a *Consciencious Scruple*.

Can it be supposed, that any Man in his Senses would, from a Principle of **sordid Covetousness**, suffer the Loss of Ten Pounds, when he could have been discharged of the Debt for Ten Pence; or Two Hundred, when he could have got clear for the payment of Ten Pounds; permit his Estate to be Exchequered, when the Tithe of the Law-Charges would have answered the Demands of the Priests; be separated from his Wife and Family

several Years, and confined to a nasty Prison, when his necessary Expences there, for the space of Twelve Months, would have satisfied the decimating Priest's Demands; or have sealed his Testimony with his Blood, as many of our Friends have done? With Instances of this nature, I could fill a large Volume; but seeing most Counties in this Nation are Eye-witnesses of such like Transactions, I shall, on that Consideration, omit the recital of them at present. Now let the Rector's *honest Neighbours* determine, whether they can imagine, that any Society of People, meerly out of *Covetousness*, would undergo such severe Sufferings, and lose Ten, Twenty, or an Hundred times more than was demanded?

We bear a publick Testimony against Tithes,
1. Because neither Christ nor his Apostles ever received or required them from their Profelytes.

2. Because Tithes were part of the Ceremonial Law, and that Priesthood being abolished, consequently its Maintenance ceases; according to the Saying of the Author to the
Heb. 7. *Hebrews, For the Priesthood being changed, there*
12. *is made of necessity a Change also of the Law.*

3. Because he that observes any of the Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, makes himself thereby Debtor to the whole Law; as may be naturally concluded from the Apostle's words to the
Gal. 3. *Galatians, For I testifie again, says he, to every Man that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to the whole Law.* If Circumcision, which in
Rom. 4. *another place is by Paul called, The Seal of the*
11. *Righteousness of the Faith unto Abraham,* obliges him

him that is circumcised to the observance of the whole Law; why do not Tithes also, which were no less abrogated by Christ's coming in the Flesh, than Circumcision?

4. Because the Temple, Tabernacle, Tithes, Offerings, Sabbaths, Feasts, Purifications, &c. were all Shadows, Types and Figures of things to come; the Substance or Antitype of these, Christ appearing in the prepared Body, ended them: For this Reason, he that pays Tithes, implicitly denies Jesus Christ crucified. Hence some have aptly concluded, concerning the Payment of Tithes, just as the Apostle did concerning Circumcision, viz. *If you pay Tithes, Gal. 5. 2. Christ shall profit you nothing.* These Motives, and not *Sordid Covetousness*, have embolden'd us to bear our Testimonies against the Payment of Tithes, even with our **Blood**: For we had rather Sacrifice our All, than deny our Lord and Saviour, who shed his most precious Blood for our Redemption.

He that assigns our Non-payment of Tithes to an *Implacable Hatred of the Preachers of the Christian Religion*, does us great Injustice, and says what he never can prove. We are so far from hating them, that we do believe it is our Indispensible Duty to administer our Temporals to those, who feed us with Spirituall, according to their Necessities: But to enable them to live Great, to keep a Coach (which is a piece of Grandeur, superiour to any our Lord and Master, or his Disciples, ever enjoyed) by our Offerings, as there is no Gospel-Precept for it, so it hath not been our method. Neither do we
conceive,

conceive, that any can justly be taxed with Injustice for retaining his *Tithes*, seeing by the Laws of Equity every Man has as great a right to the Tenth of his Labours, as to the other Nine Parts; and those may properly be termed *Unjust*, who covet their Neighbours Goods, to which, by the Laws of Nature, they have no Right nor Title.

P. 113. *The Ministers of the Gospel have, by the Laws of Jesus Christ, a just Right to a Maintenance; for*
 1 Cor. 9. St. Paul saith, That the Lord hath ordained,
 14. that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel.

We have always favoured this Doctrine, believing, that a Maintenance, by the Laws of the Gospel, is due to the Ministers of Jesus Christ, but not by Tithes, or a forced Maintenance: On this score, we our selves do administer to our necessitous Teachers, supplying them with such things they stand in need of. But to compel such as are stigmatized with the odious Names of *vile Wretches, Hereticks, Blasphemers, &c.* to support our Ministry, hath not been our method, nor that of the Primitive Saints, who rejected the Offerings of such as were not in Unity with them. Did these ever rob the Fatherless, or imprison the Widow, for their Subsistence, as too many of their nominal Followers have lately done? Certainly no: These can affirm, but not prove, that they are Gospel-Ministers; nay, should we judge by the Actions of many of them, we should rather conclude, they were listed under the Banner of Satan, than of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

They

They (Quakers) pretend, that paying or receiving Tithe, is denying Christ to be come in the Flesh : How so ? Is supporting those that preach up the Necessity of Faith in Jesus Christ, a Mark of being the Subjects of Antichrist ? P. 113.

Our Belief is, That whoever pays or receives Tithes, implicitly denies Jesus Christ to be come in the Flesh, and that Christ will profit such nothing. To his Query, *Is supporting those that preach up the necessity of Faith in Jesus Christ, a Mark of being the Subjects of Antichrist ?* My Answer is, The supporting of those that preach up the Necessity of Faith in Jesus Christ, by Presents, or voluntary Contributions, is no Mark of being the Subjects of Antichrist. But to support our Ministry by Tithes, is, according to Scripture-Account, to make us the Servants of the Ceremonial Law.

He goes on, *Or is having a competent Maintenance to that end, any part of the Ceremonial Law ?* P. 113.

For the Ministers of Christ to have a competent Maintenance, if their Necessities require it, is no part of the Ceremonial Law : But to take Tithes for that end, is a part of it. He that is desirous to be more fully informed with our Reasons for the Non-payment of Tithes, is recommended to *Thomas Ellwood's Foundation of Tithes shaken, &c.* where this Subject is largely discussed.

I desire you to accept of this small Present, as a publick Testimony of that great Regard and Kindness I have for P. 113.

Had I, id, I desire you to accept of this
small Present as a publick Testimony of that
great

great Regard and Kindness I have for your *Tithes*, doubtless he had published the true Motive of all his Scribbles. I am satisfied, it is the *Baal of Tithes*, as the *Snake's* Phrase is, and not our pretended Errors, that originally excited such a Drove of *Priests* to vent their Malice against us.

P. 114. *The Quakers I know will give me no quarter; opposing their Errors is such an unpardonable Crime, that whoever dares be so hardy as to encounter them, must never expect to be forgiven.*

We have no Quarrel at the Person of this Opponent, but at his Evil Actions; we are ready to give him quarter, tho' we cannot approve of all his proceedings, when he demands it. We esteem those that, in a Spirit of Love and Tenderneſs, tho' in their Ignorance, endeavour to inform us of what they miscall *Errors*; and do daily forgive such as designedly injure us, and heartily desire God to Pardon them: In the Catalogue of these, I reckon my Antagonist.

P. 114. His following words are, *These Men usually pass amongst us for a sort of Quiet, Peaceable and Inoffensive People; and those that converse with them only about ordinary Business, and the common Affairs of Life, would be almost tempted to believe, that scarce any thing could put them out of Humour.*

With no small Pleasure do I read this Passage: What greater Encomiums can be given of any Society, than that they are a *quiet and inoffensive People*, and not easily put out of Humour? Would to God that all of us may always live, so as to deserve this Character.

He continues, *And yet do but tell them of some* P. 115.
of their pernicious Principles, and then these poor
innocent Lambs, for all their half smile, will Rail
and Revile, like so many Furies.

The Rector had done well, had he nominated those Individuals, who will Rail and Revile, like so many Furies, when they are told of their pernicious Principles; I know none amongst us, that are guilty thereof. To hear themselves falsely accused, possibly some may be subject to express themselves in the Language of the Prophets, Apostles, &c. when they have the same Motives they had; but severer Expressions, I am satisfied, none of our Friends have used, than what the Servants of God in former Ages have left us in their Writings, upon the like occasions.

They (Quakers) have given me a Cast of their P. 115.
 Office; and thank them for their Love, I have tasted already of their Scolding Civilities; they have compared me to the Scribes and Pharisees, and have called me Brother in Iniquity with Bugg, a restless Incendiary, and guilty of Lying Accusations; Dear Brother in Enmity with the Author of the Snake, &c.

If any of our Friends have done my Opponent any Kindness deserving his Thanks, I am glad of it. He saith indeed, that he hath tasted of *their Scolding Civilities*; as a Proof, in the Margin is cited a Mss. of one Henry Pickworth: Whether such a Mss. was ever sent him, or no, I am uncertain; but admitting it was, how comes it to pass, that H. P. is multiplied into *their* and *they*?

Can

Can ~~their~~ and ~~they~~ be properly attributed to a Single Person? If not, why is this *H. P.* doubled?

P. 115. He goes on, *They (H. P.) have compared me to the Scribes and Pharisees.*

As long as the *Rector* walks in their steps, and acts as they did, there is no great cause of Complaint, tho' a Parallel should be drawn between him and them.

He subjoyns, *And have called me Brother in Iniquity with Bugg.*

Has he so? Doubtless he had very good Reasons for joyning you two together.

His subsequent words are, *A Restless Adversary.*

I can readily concur with my Friend herein.

He continues, *And guilty of Lying Accusations.*

The Truth of this Assertion I have sufficiently proved in the preceding Pages.

His following terms are, *Dear Brother in Enmity with the Author of the Snake.*

The Envy and Malice of my Opponent, and that of the *Snake*, are so evident, from their wresting of our *Friends* Words, Partiality in Quotation, &c. that I see not any material Objection that can be urged against their being joyned together, as *Brethren in Enmity*; unless it be on a supposition, that it will be an undervaluing to the *Snake*, to have one placed in the same *Classis* with him, who hath borrowed a great part of what he hath said out of his Writings: On this Consideration, it may be no great Credit to the Author of the *Snake*,

Snake, to have a *Plagiary* placed in the same rank with himself.

Now I publickly appear against them, I would P. 115.
gladly Compound for such kind and gentle Usage.

He that reproves others for their *Scolding Civilities*, should not run into the same Error himself: Are not **vile Wretches, Blasphemers, Hereticks, &c.** harder Names, than *Brother in Iniquity with Bugg, a restless Incendiary, guilty of Lying Accusations, &c?* He seems to dislike these in our Friend, yet can use harsher himself: Would he entertain us with soft Words, he might expect the like Treatment from us. Nevertheless, in this I dare be positive, that severer Expressions he will not meet with in my Reply, than what may be parallell'd with others in his own Writings.

He annexes, *However if they will but answer* P. 115.
me fairly, and upon the square, Section by Section,
I shall not much trouble my self about their hard Names.

Whether I have answered my Adversary *fairly and upon the square*, or no, is left to the Decision of the Judicious. But if a Reply to all his Sections will render it acceptable, therein I have taken particular care to oblige him: And let J. S. but duly consider the weight of my Arguments, and give them direct Answers; I shall not trouble my self about his Uncivil Language, with which he is too subject to entertain his Opponents.

His following words are, *And if they will not* P. 115.
do this, it's plain that they are conscious of their own
Guilt, and that their Principles cannot be defended.

If

If a neglect of answering the Rector, *Section by Section*, is an Argument of our Guilt, and that our Principles cannot be defended; then I conceive, that a full and ample Reply to all his Sections, is a Demonstration of our Innocency, and that our Principles may be defended: That this is done in the foregoing Pages, is undeniable.

P. 115,
116.

I shall not be so vain to say, that the World hath not heard of a great many of these matters before; yet I am pretty Confident the Quakers have not fairly answered them, nor I believe ever can.

Had my Opponent had the vanity to say, that the World hath not heard of the greatest part of these Objections before, none that have been acquainted with this thread-bare Controversy would have believed him. Were these *new Discoveries*, which he pretends to have made, collected together, probably they would not fill one page of his Book. According to my thoughts, some of them have more exposed his Ignorance, than our falsely supposed Unsoundness in Principle: We had not doubted of his *Confidence*, had he been silent therein. We are Satisfied, that we have fairly answered what has been formerly objected against us, and doubt not, with Divine Assistance, to do the like for the future. There are a Set of People, who will not take an answer, but had rather have us in the wrong, than in the right; and say what one will, they'll continue to repeat certain Passages, without heeding our Explications of 'em: These we consider as weak, wilful, and impertinent Persons; consequently not deserving our Notice.

I have

I have not, to my knowledge, wronged them, p. 116. either in Book, Citation, or Inference.

'Tis possible, that my Antagonist hath not wronged us in *Book*; But if he should affirm it a Thousand times, that he hath not injured us in *Citation* and *Inference*, I cannot assent to it. What greater Injustice can be done a Writer in *Citation*, than to leave out the Cardinal terms in the middle of a sentence, without any mark of a deficiency; to pare off certain terms, that go before or follow after a Passage, which would have evidently determined the sense otherwise, than when clipped it seems to bear; or have altered any of the principal Words in the period objected against; or have made the Predicate of one Subject, the Predicate of another? These things the Rector is proved guilty of. If these methods in *Citation* are allowable, then we are not wronged; but if such like proceedings are not to be countenanced, then we are injured; and how these things could be done, without his knowledge, I cannot imagine.

Is that *inference* justly drawn, which apparently thwarts the Context, is opposite to the visible intent and drift of the Author, and repugnant to his own Sayings in several other places of his Writings? That J. S. makes such Inferences, may be seen from diverse Pages in the preceding Discourse.

It is only the Truth of the Christian Religion, p. 116. that I contend for.

To appear in defence of the *Truth of the Christian Religion*, is very commendable, against all its Opposers; but that this was the only

R

Mo-

Motive of J. S's Writings, I cannot believe: For had that been the sole Object of his Thoughts, doubtless he would never have used such indirect means to have accomplished it; because the *Truth of the Christian Religion* may easily be defended against the most Powerful Batteries of the acutest Sophister, without Partial Citations, Strained Inferences, &c.

P. 116. *I am in my Conscience fully perswaded, that where Quakerism gets footing, there the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles loses ground.*

In like manner I solemnly declare, That the contrary is my Belief; and *am in my Conscience fully perswaded*, that where our Principles are sincerely embraced, there the Primitive Doctrine, Spirit and Life of Christ and his Apostles will flourish; and all Superstition, Carnal Worship, Mercenary Ministry, and Persecution will cease.

A N
Instructive and Invitatory
POSTSCRIPT,
T O

*John Stillingfleet's Honest Neighbours,
That may be Enquiring after Pure and
Primitive Christianity.*

By **Richard Claridge.**

Friends and Countrymen!

THE *Author of the foregoing Vindication, ha-*
ving fully Answered the false Charges of
Error, Heresie and Blasphemy, which J. S. hath
brought against us; and wip'd off that *Dirt,*
which he, under Pretence of some *New Dis-*
coveries, hath rak'd out of the *Channels* of for-
merly *Baffled Adversaries,* and thrown upon the
Blessed Truth, which the Lord, in this the Day
of his *Glorious and Powerful Appearance,* hath,
of his great Mercy in and through his Son
Christ Jesus, made a Remnant Living Witnesses
of; I feel a weighty Concern upon my Spirit,
in the pure Openings of the Love of God, ten-
derly to Advise and Beseech you, as ye Value
the Honour of God, the Peace of your Con-

sciences, and the Eternal Welfare of your Immortal Souls, not to suffer your selves to be any longer imposed upon, by the Artifices of the said J. S. or any other Mercenary Teacher; who may Flatter you for certain By-Ends, while they Bespatter *Truth*, and the *Faithful Professors* of it, to Scare you, if possible, with Portentous Shapes and Terrible Misrepresentations, from Enquiring after the Things, which truly belong to your Everlasting Peace and Happiness: But to be perswaded and prevailed with, by *one who seeks not Yours but You*, to hearken to the *Voice of the True Shepherd, Christ Jesus*, who is come to seek and to save that which is lost; and to sit under his *Free and Heavenly Ministry*; whereby ye may come to see and know, not only your *Undone Condition in the Fall*, but also the *Sure and Certain Way and Means* of your Recovery and Deliverance thereout. For *I myself* was sometimes in a Dark and Unbelieving State, as Multitudes both of *Priests and People* are at this Day, till it pleased God to *Call me by his Grace, and Reveal his Son in me*; but now, having tasted of the great Redemption that comes by Jesus Christ, and knowing that the Love of God is Universally Extended, 'tis the Labour and Travel of my Soul, that you and all the Children of Men may come to be Effectual Sharers therein, and be Actual Partakers of that Liberty, wherewith Christ alone makes free.

It is the Salvation of your precious and never-dying Souls, that lies weightily before me; for it pities me to see the People so miserably deceived, through the *Craft or Blindness* of their
pretended

pretended Spiritual Guides; and in danger of *perishing*, by the *Mismanagement* of those, call'd, *Ghostly Fathers*, to whose Conduct they are inflav'd.

I am perswaded, this *Application* will not be unwelcome and unacceptable to many, that are *Honest and Sincere-Hearted*; because 'tis an *Address* of Love to their Souls: But as for those, who are otherwise-minded, they may possibly reject it with *Indignation*; and return *Contumely* and *Scorn*, for so *Christian* and *Friendly an Overture*. However I have Peace and Satisfaction in what I do on this Behalf, and shall leave the Issue to the Lord; in *whose Hands are the Hearts of all Men*, and who will Turn the *Willing and Obedient*, and can Restrain the *Stubborn and Contradictious*.

'Tis no New or Strange thing to us, who are called *Quakers*, to be hardly dealt with by our Inveterate Adversaries, to be *Defam'd*, *Reproach'd* and *Malign'd*; for so were the *Prophets* persecuted, that were before us: So was *Christ* himself evilly intreated by a Wicked and Adulterous Generation; Some said, *He was a Samaritan, and had a Devil*, John 8. 48. others said, *He was a Man Gluttonous, and a Wine-bibber, a Friend of Publicans and Sinners*, Mat. 11. 19. His Disciples and Followers cannot look for better Treatment from Men of Perverse Spirits, than he himself met with. *For the Disciple is not above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord. It is enough for the Disciple, that he be as his Master, and the Servant as his Lord: If they have called the Master of the House Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his Household?* Mat. 10.

24, 25.

The Apostle Paul was traduced as an *Here-
rick*, Acts 24. 14. As a *Mad-man*, Acts 26. 24.
A Pestilent Fellow, a *Mover of Sedition* among all
the Jews throughout the World, Acts 24. 5. A
Polluter of the Temple, Acts 21. 28. A *Babbler*,
a *Setter forth of strange Gods*, and a *Broacher of
new Doctrines*, Acts 17. 18, 19. He and Silas,
as *Teachers of Unlawful Customs*, Acts 16. 21.
and *Turners of the World upside-down*, vers. 6.
So Stephen was accused of *speaking blasphemous
Words against Moses, and against God; against the
Holy Place, and the Law*, Acts 6. 11, 13. And
all this for their *Testimony to Truth, and Love
to the Souls of Men*.

The *Primitive Christians* were branded by
their Enemies with Infamous and Abominable
Things; that, 'They made Lust a part of their
'Religion, Worshipp'd the Head of an As,
'and Ador'd a Man that was crucified for
'his Villanies, *Minutius Felix in Octavio*. That,
'they Sacrificed a Child in their Assemblies,
'and when they had eaten and devoured his
'Body, they committed Incest, *Tertull. Apol.*
c. 7. That, 'they used the Suppers of *Thyestes*,
'and the Incestuous Carnal Copulation of *Oedi-
pus*, *Enseb. l. 5. c. 1*. Yea, that, 'Men, Wo-
'men, Children, Brothers, Sisters, People of all
'Ages, Conditions and Sexes, met together;
'and after they had Eaten and Drank to Excess,
'and the Heat of the Wine and Meats began
'to Kindle their Blood, and Provoke their
'Lust; they ty'd a Dog to a Candlestick, to
'whom they cast a Morsel, which was so far
'out of his Reach, that in striving to Leap at
'it, he overthrew the Candlestick, and put out
'the

‘ the Light. And thus having rid themselves
 ‘ of the only Witness of their Infamous
 ‘ Actions, and taking Boldness from shameful
 ‘ Darkness, they confusedly mix’d themselves
 ‘ together, as it happen’d, *Minutius Felix*, *ibid.*
Tertull. ubi supra.

Thus were the *Prophets*, *Christ* himself, the
Apostles and *Primitive Christians* misrepresented,
 slander’d and abused by their Malicious En-
 mies; and upon no other account, than for
 their Witnessing to the *Truth*, and endeavour-
 ing the Conversion and Salvation of the Chil-
 dren of Men.

And so inrag’d were their Enemies against
 the *Primitive Christians*, that in *Tertullian’s* Time,
 ‘ the very Name of *Christian* was enough alone
 ‘ to make a Man Criminal, *Apol. c. 44.* The
 ‘ Hatred, *saith he*, wherewith this Name is
 ‘ pursued, so blinds the Minds of most, that
 ‘ notwithstanding they cannot but other-
 ‘ wise give a Man a good Testimony; yet they
 ‘ make it Reproachful to have embraced this
 ‘ Religion. *One crys*, *Caius Sejus* is a Good
 ‘ Man, but that he is a Christian: *Another says*,
 ‘ I admire that *Lucius*, a Wise Man, is suddenly
 ‘ become a Christian, *Apol. c. 3.*

And as it was then, so it is now; If a Man
 or Woman Turn *Quaker*, as they phrase it, a
 Nickname for a True and Real Christian; how
 are they Wonder’d at, Derided and Reproach’d
 by the Loose and Hypocritical Professors of this
 Age! If they Renounce the Devil, and all his
 Works, the Poms and Vanities of this wicked
 World, and all the Sinful Lusts of the Flesh; if
 they cannot joyn with them in their Rioting and

Drunkenness, in their Swearing and Fighting, in their Pride and Wantonness, in their Games and Sports, in their Cruelty and Oppression; nor Comply with the *Priests* in their Surplices and Ceremonies, in their Rubricks and Canons, in their Prayers and Preachings, in their Crosses and Sacraments, in their Tithes and Offerings, and other their Humane Modes and Institutions; but are concern'd in Conscience towards God, and Faithfulness to their own Souls, to Withdraw and Separate themselves from Sin and False Worship; tho' they are never so Sound in the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, never so Orthodox in Doctrine, never so Vertuous in Life, Just, Sober, and Peaceable in Conversation; what Outcries are presently raised against them, by many of the *Priests* of this Generation!

But tho' this Sort of Usage fall out to be our Portion, and we may be reckon'd as *the Filth* and *Off-scouring of all things*; yet we rejoyce in Reproaches, and are glad, that we are counted Worthy to suffer shame for the sake of Christ. Rejoyce, saith the Apostle *Peter*, in as much as ye are Partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his Glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding Joy. If ye be reproached for the Name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of Glory and of God resteth upon you: On their Part he is evil spoken of, but on your Part he is Glorified, 1 Pet. 4. 13, 14.

And tho' we write *Apologies* and *Defences* in behalf of our Principles and Practices, when a necessity is laid upon us, for the Clearing of Truth and Stopping the Mouths of Gainsayers, and therein use sometimes a Sharpness of Expression;

pression ; yet 'tis in the Language of *Truth* and *Soberness*, and our Adversaries may see, if they do not wilfully shut their Eyes, that our Opposition is not against their Persons, which we Love; but against their Errors, which we are Convinc'd of, and therefore Cannot comply with, but must Detect and Refute them.

And for the further Satisfaction of all Un-biass'd and Unprejudic'd Persons, who may be Inquisitive to know the Reasons of this and other of our *Vindications* ; they may be assur'd, that we do not Oppose, to use the Words of Judge *Hale* in his *Nature of True Religion*, p. 19. " out of a Frowardness or Peevishness of Mind ; " or out of Pride, or a Spirit of Opposition ; " but in the Sincerity and Simplicity of *our* " Hearts, and out of a Tenderness for the " Honour of God : For the Christian Religion is quite another thing, than what some Men make it, who dress it up with Humane Traditions and Inventions, and then press it upon the Consciences of Men, as the Faith and Worship of our Lord Jesus Christ. But blessed be the Name of the Lord for ever, who hath opened our Eyes with the *Light of his holy Spirit* ; we see through this Paint and Artifice of Bold and Cunning Obtruders. For the *Vail* being taken off in *Christ*, we see Religion in its *Native Plainness, Simplicity and Purity*, and have separated from it the Additions and Superstructions of Men.

We do believe, that, *God is a Spirit, and they that Worship him, must Worship him in Spirit and in Truth*, John 4. 24. *For the Father seeketh such to Worship him*, vers. 23. But in vain they
do

do *Worship him, teaching for Doctrines the Com-
mandments of Men*, Mat. 15. 9. That *Christ
Jesus, who was and is truly God, and truly Man,*
in Wonderful and Inseparable Union, is the
only Foundation and Object of our Faith and
Hope. Neither is there Salvation in any other: For

*there is none other Name under Heaven
given among, or in Men, whereby, or in
which, we must be saved*, Acts 4. 12.

That *He is the Mediator of the New Testament*;
Heb. 9. 15. The only Mediator between God and
Man, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5. That
the Spirit of Truth, which he promised to send,
and doth proceed from the Father, is come,
and testifieth of Christ; see John 15. 26. That
there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the
Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these
Three are One, 1 John 5. 7. That, Christ died
for all, 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. Gave himself a Ran-
som for all, 1 Tim. 2. 6. Tasted Death for every
Man, Heb. 2. 9. Is the Propitiation for our Sins,
and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the
whole World, 1 John 2. 2. For as by the Offence
of One, Judgment came upon All Men to Condem-
nation: Even so by the Righteousness of One, [Je-
sus Christ] the Free Gift came upon All Men unto
Justification of Life, Rom. 5. 18.

Now as the Death of Christ is Universally
Extended; so in order to fit and prepare
Men for the receiving and applying the Saving
Benefits thereof unto themselves, The Mani-
festation of the Spirit is given to Every Man to
profit withal, 1 Cor. 12. 7. I am come, saith
Christ, a Light into the World, that whosoever
believeth in me, should not abide in Darkness,

John

John 12. 46. *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared unto all Men, Tit. 2. 11. And as Men mind and attend unto the Light, Spirit and Grace of Christ in their own Hearts; so it will first discover to them their Sins, and their utter Inability to save themselves therefrom, by Vertue of any Strength, Power, or Free-will of their own; and then shew them, in, by, and from whom alone Strength and Salvation are to be had, namely, Jesus Christ; Who was delivered for our Offences, and was raised again for our Justification, Rom. 4. 25. For without his Light to Enlighten, and his Spirit and Grace to Teach and Inable; Men can neither Know Christ Effectually, nor Believe in him Savingly; notwithstanding the Universal Extent of his Sufferings, Death and Resurrection.*

From hence therefore it is, that we Direct Men to the *Light, Spirit, and Grace of Christ* in their Hearts, according to the Testimonies of Christ and his Apostles: Because unless Christ be Believed in, and Obey'd in his *Inward Appearance*; all that Men may know of Him *Outwardly*, by the *Scriptures*, will avail them little in the Great Concern of their Salvation. For tho' the *Holy Scriptures, given by Divine Inspiration*, are to be prefer'd to all other Writings extant in the World; yet they cannot give Men *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*; they cannot *Quickenthe Dead in Sins and Trespases*; they are *Witnesses and Declarations* of these things, not *Efficient Causes* thereof; Christ alone is the Author and Giver of them; and if ever Men expect

expect to have them, they must come unto him for them. So that tho' we have an High and Honourable Esteem for the *Holy Scriptures*; yea, a more Sensible Value for them, since our Believing in the *Light*, than we had before; because our Understandings are open'd thereby in the Knowledge of them, and they open'd to our Understandings; so that they remain no longer a *Scaled Book* to us, with respect to the Things, that *Absolutely* belong to our Everlasting Peace: Yet still they are but *Scriptures*, that is, *Writings* of the *Truth*; they are not *Christ*, the *Truth*; and therefore, notwithstanding we do firmly Believe whatsoever they testify concerning God, *Christ*, the *Holy Spirit*, *Repentance*, *Faith*, *Justification*, *Forgiveness* of *Sins*, the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, the *Resurrection* of the *Just* and *Unjust*, *Heaven* and *Hell*, *Eternal Rewards* and *Punishments*; yet that we may Effectually and Savingly know, every one for our selves, that *God is our Father*, *Christ our Saviour*, the *Holy Spirit our Teacher*, *Sanctifier* and *Preserver*; that we are *Members of Christ's Mystical Body*, and *Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven*, we must come further than bare *Outward Historical Faith and Knowledge*, (which a *Natural Man* in his *Natural State* may have) viz. to the *Inward Experimental Work and Testimony* of the *Spirit of Adoption*, whereby we can cry, *Abba, Father*. For 'tis the *Spirit* it self, that gives us our saving Evidence, by witnessing with our *Spirit*, that we are the *Children of God*; see *Rom. 8. 15, 16.*

The Christian Religion consists not of *Elementary Types, Figures* and *Shadows*, of *Carnal Rites* and *Ceremonial Observations*, after the *Rudiments*

of

of this World; but 'tis a Religion of, *Life and Substance*, and stands in the *Demonstration of the Spirit and Power of God*; not in the *Speculations and Wisdom of Man*. It teaches us to *Love the Lord our God with all our Heart, with all our Soul, with all our Strength, and with all our Mind, and our Neighbour as our selves*, Luke 10. 27. To deny *Ungodliness and Worldly Lusts*, and to live *Soberly, Righteously and Godly in this present World*: Looking for that blessed Hope, and the glorious *Appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ*. Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and purifie unto himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works. Tit 2. 12, 13, 14.

'The only acceptable Offering to God, saith an ancient Apologist for the Christian Religion, is a Good Mind, a Pure Heart, and Sincere Conscience. So that he who Lives Innocently, prays acceptably to God; he that Deals Justly, presents him with an Offering of a sweet Savour; he that abstains from Fraud, propitiates him; he that rescues a Man from Danger, kills the fattest Victim. These are our Sacrifices; these are our Mysteries. So that with us, the more Righteous any Man is, the more Religious we esteem him. *Mitius Felix in Octavio*.

'The Holy Majesty of God, saith *Lactantius*, desires nothing else of Man, but Innocence; and he that offers him that, is a Devout and Pious Sacrificer, *Institut. l. 6. c. 1*. 'The Religion which is from Heaven, consisteth not of Corruptible Things, but of the Vertues of the Mind, whose Original is above. This is
'the

the True Worship, wherein the Mind of the Worshipper presents it self an Immaculate Sacrifice to God, *Idem. c. 2.*

He, saith *Augustin*, is a true Christian, who shews Mercy unto all, is not moved by the Affronts of any, feels the Sorrows of another, as tho' they were his own, whose Table is known to the Poor, who is inglorious in the sight of Men, that he may have Glory before God and his Angels; and despiseth Earthly Things, that he may have the Enjoyment of Heavenly. *De Vita Christiana.*

The Christian Religion, saith *Grotius*, teacheth, That as God is a most pure Spirit; so is he to be Worshipped with Pureness of Mind and Spirit.—The Professors thereof are not to Circumcise the Flesh, but their Carnal Lusts and Desires.—The chief Point of this Religion lies in a Pious Confidence, by which being composed to a faithful Obedience, we rely wholly upon God, and stedfastly believe the performance of his Promises. Whence there arises a good Hope, and a true Love both of God, and our Neighbours: Which makes us obey his Precepts, not in a basely servile Manner, for Fear of Punishment; but that we may please and have him, out of his great Goodness, our Father and Rewarder. Moreover, we are taught to Pray, not for Riches or Honours, or such things, as many times do hurt to those, that wish much for them: But first and chiefly, that which tendeth to God's Glory; then for our selves, so much of these Perishing Things, as Nature needeth; leaving the rest to Divine Providence.

‘A

‘ And satisfying our selves, that all shall be
 ‘ well, which way soever things go. But for
 ‘ Eternal Things, it teacheth us to Pray with
 ‘ the most earnest Desire, *viz.* for Pardon of
 ‘ our Sins past, and the Assistance of God’s
 ‘ Spirit in time to come; whereby, being
 ‘ strengthened against all Terrors and Allure-
 ‘ ments, we may constantly persevere in an
 ‘ Holy Course of Life. This is the Worship
 ‘ of God in the Christian Religion; than
 ‘ which, nothing can be invented more Wor-
 ‘ thy of God. *De Veritate Rel. Christ. lib. 2.*
Seet. 11. Edit. Amstelodami, 1680.

This is *Pure and Undeiled Religion*, which
 Christ and his Apostles taught; and which
 the Primitive Believers Professed and Practised,
 and found Peace and Rest in to their *Immor-*
tal Souls. And to this it is, that I earnestly
 Invite you in the dear Love of God, as it was
 in its primordial Beauty; before *Antichrist*
 appeared, and the *Apostasie* came in, with
 Numerous Additions, Various Heterodox Opi-
 nions, and ‘Sundry Modes of Superstitious
 Worship, which have been Set up, Maintained
 and Imposed, with Unchristian Fierceness
 and Rigor, under the Specious Title of
 Christianity; yet having little in it, besides
 the Bare Name.

My End and Design in this Address, is not
 to Profelyte you to a *Seet or Party*, or to any
Humane Inventions and Traditions; but to Be-
 seech you to Receive and Embrace the *Blessed*
Truth, which is *One*, and was before any *Seets*
 or

or *Parties, Divisions or Subdivisions* were: Or, which is the same in effect, to Turn to that of God in your selves, the *Light and Spirit of Christ*, and to *Believe and Walk in it*, that ye may be *Children of the Light*, and *Inheritors among them*, that are *Sanctified by Faith in Christ Jesus*.

This will be your *Comfort in Life*, your *Hope at Death*, and after *Death* your *Crown of Rejoycing for Ever and Ever*.

AP 59

I. The

'b
'a
'a
'o
'o
'in
'G
the
Tho
of
able
P.
'Bl
'th
'O
'Pr
'the
'Ag

I. *The Judgment of Judge Hale concerning the Quakers, and their Doctrines and Practices.*

‘Take away *Some Singularities*, the Men are as other Men ; Some indeed very Sober, Honest, Just and Plain-Hearted Men, and Sound in *Mast*, if not *All* the Important Doctrines and Practices of Christianity. See his Book intituled, *The Judgment of the late Lord Chief Justice, Sir Matthew Hale, Of the Nature of True Religion*, p. 15. Printed 1684.

II. *The Confession of a Nameless Author touching the Quakers, their Principle and Conversation.*

‘I have diligently look’d into the Controversy, that is ‘between our *Brethren* and the *Quakers*, not with a Partial or Captious, but with a Single and Indifferent Eye ; ‘and I do not find, that the *Quakers* are either Guilty ‘of those Real Errors, that are laid to their Charge ; ‘or, that those, which our *Brethren* suppose to be *Errors* ‘in them, are Errors at all, but are rather Glorious ‘Gospel Truths. See *The Letter from a Clergy-Man in the Country, to a Clergy-Man in the City, Containing Free Thoughts about the Controversy, between some Ministers of the Church of England, and the Quakers, with Seasonable Advice to his Brethren, to study Peace and Moderation*, P. 5. Printed 1701.

Again, ‘The *Quakers*, which some call *Hereticks* and ‘*Blasphemers*, but still want Proof for these Odious Epithets, are Sound and Orthodox Livers ; yea, they not only ‘Outstrip us in Real Piety and Veriue, but in Faith and ‘Principle too ; and for my part, I do believe, they are ‘the People, whom God hath raised up in this Dreggy ‘Age of the World, to Refine it, and Restore fall’n
§ ‘Christianity

Christianity to it's Primitive State of Perfection and Innocency; p. 10.

Ibid. 'The Sober and Peaceable Quakers; An Honest and Conscientious People.

Again, 'Their Principle is Pure and Holy, and their Conversation generally such, as becomes the Gospel of Christ. p. 11.

III. Dr. John Edward's Testimony concerning the Quakers, their Sobriety, Gravity, &c.

'The Quakers are very Strict and Precise in their Looks, Garb, Speeches, Behaviour, above other Persons, and make great shew of Sobriety and Self-denial. Whilst they talk much of a *Light Within them*, they do not neglect the Outward Lustre and Shining of their Lives. Whilst Men and Women of other Perswasions (to their Shame be it spoken) are given too much to a Vain Affecting of Fashions, to Pride of Apparel, to Lightness, Wantonness and Luxury, things hugely unbecoming their Holy Profession, those Persons in the mean time abstain from the Sins of the Time, and declare against the Vanities of the Age. I have read some of their Books (as Barclay's &c.) with great delight, wherein they Exhort to Self-denial, abandoning of Carnal Pleasures, Worldly Lusts and Vanities, and all Excess; and this with great Warmth and Zeal, and in Pathetick and Choice Words. They Excellently represent Temperance, Charity, Gravity, Humility, and other Moral Accomplishments. They worthily Extol a Virtuous Life, and fall into some Noble Raptures and Heights, whilst they are doing so: In a Word, They seem to Preach Nothing, but a Divine Life and Heaven. See his *Free Discourse concerning Truth and Errors, especially in Matters of Religion*, p. 128, 129. Printed 1701.

IV. Some

IV. *Some Passages quoted out of the fore-mentioned Book of Judge Hale.*

I. *Concerning the Episcopal Clergy.*

‘ **A**S to the Pope’s Supremacy, they Disdain it; but if you acknowledge not *Episcopal Government*; if you Swear not *Canonical Obedience* to your Ordinary, if you Submit not to the *Liturgy*, and *Ceremonies*, and *Vestments*, and *Musick* used in the Church, you are at Best a *Schismatick*. p. 28.

‘ If they see a Man, Otherwise of *Orthodox Principles*, of a *Pious* and *Religious Life*, yet if Scrupling *Some Points of Ecclesiastical Government*, tho’ Peaceable, they will Esteem him little better than a *Heathen* or *Publican*, a *Schismatick*, *Heretick*, and what not: On the other side, if they see a Man of great Fervour in Asserting the *Ecclesiastical Government*, Observant of *External Ceremonies*, tho’ otherwise of a *Loose and Dissolute Life*; yet they will be ready to applaud him with the Stile of a *Son of the Church*, and upon that Account overlook the Mis carriage of his Life, as if the Essence and Life of Christian Religion lay in the bare Asserting of the best Form of Ecclesiastical Government, p. 11.

2. *Concerning some of those Motives, that excite them to maintain their Humane Institutions.*

1. ‘ Observing that certain Modes and Forms, and the Rigorous Observations of them, are the common Road for attaining *Preferments*, or *Favours of Great Persons*, upon that Account they Exercise a Marvellous Fervour of Mind for them, and a Vigorous Opposition of all, that come not up to them in every *Punctilio*, that they may thereby be taken notice of, and employ’d as useful, and fit, and Vigorous Assertors and Instruments for this purpose.

2. Many

2. 'Many times *Gain* and *Profit* is the End and Design
 'of many Practices and Positions appendicated to Chri-
 'stian Religion, as is before observed in the *Romish*
 'Church; and it is easily observable, that *Interest*, *Pro-
 'fit*, and *Temporal Advantage*, have a strong Byass upon
 'Mens Affections, and are dearer to them, than THE
 'TRUTH of Religion, and carry Men more Vigorously
 'in their Upholding and Maintenance, than Religion it
 'self doth: And because the *Prétence* of *Zeal* for Reli-
 'gion carries a fair Plausibility with all Men, therefore
 'those very things, that are but *Engines* of *Gain* and
 'Profit, are Christened with the Specious Name of Re-
 'ligion.

'It was the Making of Silver Shrines for *Diana*, the
 'Art whereby the Artificers got their Living, that made
 'the Outcry, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*. p. 19, 20.
 Thus far Judge *Hale*.

The precited Passages being worthy of Observation,
 I have faithfully transcribed them, not only for your
 Benefit, but also for the common Good of all those,
 who lie under the Burden of *Episcopal Innovations* and
Impositions.

7 AP 59

R. C.

FINIS.

.
.
n
e
y
t
.
e
d
e
e
e
o.

n,
ur
e,
id